00110698

THE
ASIATIC SOCIETY OF BOMBAY
TOWN HALL, BOMBAY-400 023.

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016

B
B
3

INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

VOL. I.

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

CRITICAL, EXEGETICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL.

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE, AND LL.D.

110698

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1868.

AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT,

CRITICAL, EXEGETICAL, AND THEOLOGICAL.

BY SAMUEL DAVIDSON, D.D.

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF HALLE, AND LL.D.

110698

IN TWO VOLUMES.

VOL. I.

LONDON:

LONGMANS, GREEN, AND CO.

1868.

God
215
Daniel
110698

PREFACE.

THE WANT of an English Introduction to the study of the New Testament, suited to the present state of knowlege, is generally felt. During the last thirty years the progress of Biblical criticism has been marked by great changes. Conservative views of dogma have been disturbed, the New Testament records have been narrowly scrutinised, and the evidence on which their credibility rests has been subjected to a severe test. Since the publication of Strauss's 'Life of Jesus,' the gospels have attracted most attention. The subsequent appearance of Renan's 'Vie de Jésus,' and of the second 'Leben Jesu' by Strauss, awakened new interest in the subject, stirring up various feelings according to men's previous opinions. In Germany and France these works have been widely circulated, affecting the views taken of the gospels by theologians and thinkers. Nor has their influence been confined to the Continent. Thousands in Great Britain have read the volumes, pondering over their pages with sentiments of approval or dislike. The 'lives of Jesus' by Neander, Hase, Lange, Ewald and Bunsen; with the writings of Keim,

Schenkel, Colani, Pressensé, 'the English Life of Jesus,' and 'the Jesus of the Evangelists,' all bearing on the gospels, indicate active inquiry in the same direction. Since the appearance of these works the gospels can no longer be studied from the old point of view; and the remark applies to the remaining parts of the New Testament, after the searching criticism of the Tübingen school. Whatever be thought of the critical processes conducted by Baur, Zeller, Schwegler, Koestlin, and Hilgenfeld, their writings cannot be ignored; while their method renders it impossible that the Christian books should be treated as they were in the days of Lardner and Paley. Any attempt to repress the spirit of inquiry thus roused is scarcely consistent with a love of truth: and all who are anxious that the truth should be known will submit the pages of the New Testament without fear to a full investigation.

There are two good Introductions to the New Testament in the German language—those of De Wette and Bleek. The author, though moving in the same field of thought, differs from them in many instances. Representing the school of Schleiermacher, these writers are rather of the past than the present; though it cannot be denied that the critical sagacity of De Wette reached beyond his own day. But whatever may be the imperfections of those works when viewed with reference to the progress which has been made since their appearance, there is no book of the same description in English representing an equally advanced stage of Biblical criticism; for it will hardly be thought that the brief account of the books in the fourth volume of Hartwell Horne's last edition is adequate to present requirements; or that

the notices of them in recent dictionaries of the Bible show much critical depth.

It has hitherto been the custom in England to ignore views contrary to traditional opinions; if not to speak of them with strong condemnation. Our theologians, too often content with present attainments and averse to severe thought, have tried to shut out critical results long accepted as certain by the leading scholars of Germany, Holland, and France. But a better day already dawns, when reason 'the candle of the Lord' within us will be vilified no more, and the highest evidence for the divine origin of Scripture be found in the spiritual nature of man; when the sense of the written word will be seen in its native simplicity divested of the allegorical fancies, the spiritualising processes, and the distorted forms which injudicious interpreters have forced it to bear.

Since the author published his former Introduction (1848–1851), the topics embraced in it have been continually before his mind. Though often requested by correspondents to write another book, he could not think of doing so while his earlier one remained unexhausted. When that obstacle however was about to be removed, the desire of labouring again in the same field revived, especially after his Introduction to the Old Testament had been completed. Determined to conduct his investigations as though he had never written on the subject, he applied himself to the task, in the belief that he was now in a position to throw more light on writings with which man's highest hopes are connected, than he had done before. Twenty years' study may well modify, correct, or enlarge views to which an honest though

less perfect investigation had formerly led. Feeling free to follow out truth as far as he could, to judge fairly amid conflicting evidence, and to express his views calmly and candidly, he felt also that here his responsibility ended. That they should occasionally be unacceptable to some before whom they may be brought for the first time is natural; but while we uphold the right and duty of all to form an independent judgment, it is almost a truism to assert that such a judgment can be formed only by those who have a competent knowledge of the evidence.

The object of what is called an Introduction to the New Testament is well known. It should discuss all such questions affecting each book, as its age, author, object and aim, credibility, characteristics, integrity, contents. Preparatory to the work of a commentator, it often encroaches on his province. The present writer has admitted into this Introduction more interpretation than is usual in works of the same class, supposing that it will be generally acceptable; and has omitted the critical part or that relating to the Greek text, which he has treated in another work. In discussing each question he has tried to write as clearly as the nature of the subject will admit. Greek and Latin passages, as well as single phrases or words, are transferred to notes, wherever it was possible to do so, the corresponding English being given in the text. He has not discussed opinions different from his own, except when their plausibility or the influential names by which they are supported demanded notice. He hopes that intelligent laymen as well as critics will not find the book too scholastic to be studied with facility. The treatment

is as brief as possible, excluding extraneous matter in order to save space and economise the reader's time. Nothing which appeared necessary to completeness is intentionally omitted. If the author's views be not always approved, inquiry will at least be stimulated. They are not put forward lightly, but after anxious thought. Difficult questions, on which the evidence is conflicting, had to be treated, and slender probabilities required to be weighed. In these circumstances the author exercised his best judgment, reaching conclusions cautiously where acute scholars differ. Believing that his opinions will be generally admitted sooner or later, he sends them forth to the world, requesting a candid consideration on the part of the reader. The Bible, however, is a difficult book, and mistakes in explaining it can scarcely be avoided; but impartial thinkers will judge these mistakes leniently.

True critics regret to see that religion is often confounded with a system of theological dogmas. If the two things were clearly distinguished, as they ought to be, a cessation of that bitterness which theologians often show to one another might be reasonably expected. Not that a religion can exist apart from *some* theology. Still the amount of theology needed to constitute a religion may be indefinitely small. If men could see that the Spirit of God neither dwelt exclusively in apostles, nor rendered them infallible, however highly gifted they may have been, the sacred records would be less distorted, and different values would be assigned to the several parts of the volume according to their nature. When those records are held to be absolutely correct in all matters, whether historical or speculative, scien-

tific or doctrinal, they acquire a supernatural and fictitious pre-eminence similar to that which is conferred on the pope by the theory of papal infallibility; they are called God's word throughout, which they never claim to be, and thus free inquiry into their credibility is at once checked or suppressed. God's word is in the Scriptures; all Scripture is not the word of God. The writers were inspired in various degrees, and are therefore not all equally trustworthy guides to belief and conduct. In the Bible may be found all things necessary for our salvation; it is an unwarrantable inference that it contains nothing but what is thus needed for all. The Scriptures contain the highest truth; but this fact is undisturbed by the possibility that they may contain some things which are not truth. The author has thus answered by anticipation all the questions which may fairly be addressed to a writer who undertakes to introduce his readers to the study of the New Testament. Anything like a detailed confession of faith or a theological discussion would here be obviously out of place. It is unnecessary for him to draw out the meaning which he attaches to such terms as sacrifice, mediation, inspiration, revelation. If it be a meaning not accepted by certain schools, whether in the Church of England or other religious bodies, it is one for which a large array of great names may be cited, and which is strengthened by the authority of many among the profoundest of Christian thinkers. He would only remind the reader that the inquiry in which he is at present engaged is strictly confined to the ascertainment of facts: and the statements of the New Testament, not less than the subject of an original revelation, must, in

the words of Bishop Butler, be considered 'as a common question of fact.'[1] Hence he candidly acknowledges his conviction that all these statements, whether historical or doctrinal, must be submitted to the ordinary rules of critical inquiry.

In England a free current of religious thought has set in, which needs only to be guided with discretion to produce safe results. Opinions which would have excited bitter hostility not long ago, are now heard with calmness. The reputed authorship of books embraced in the canon is discussed and rejected without the idea that the inquiry is dangerous to the soul. Accredited teachers of religion may canvass the commonly received opinions about the writer of a gospel or epistle, without risking the loss of their position; at least, clergymen of the Church of England may do so, enjoying a freedom favourable to the advancement of rational Christianity, under the protection of the highest civil tribunal. Of this most valuable privilege they are expected to avail themselves.

The legal decisions of the Court of Arches and of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council ought to bear important fruit.

In the former the Dean enunciated these sentiments:—

'I think it is open for the clergy to maintain that any book in the Bible is the work of another author than him whose name it bears, provided that they conform to the sixth article by admitting that the book is an inspired writing and canonical.'

[1] Analogy, Part II. ch. ii. § 2.

'I do not find any legal authority for holding that to avow a belief that a part of Scripture is post-apostolical is necessarily a declaration of its not being canonical.'[1]

In the latter court, the following statements were officially propounded:—

'The proposition or assertion that every part of the Scriptures was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit is not to be found either in the Articles or in any of the formularies of the Church.'

'The doctrine that every part of every book of Scripture was written under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit, and is the word of God, is not involved in the statement of the sixth article that Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation.'

'The framers of the Articles have not used the word "inspiration" as applied to the Holy Scriptures; nor have they laid down anything as to the nature, extent, or limits of that operation of the Holy Scriptures.'[2]

It is unnecessary to say that many statements in the present volumes are within the limits left undefined by the founders of the National Church and the framers of her Articles, as thus interpreted. The author considers the liberty granted to clergymen wisely comprehensive, so that under the broad shield of English law they may prevent the divorce of reason and faith, science and religion; imparting a liberal direction to the thought of the age on theological subjects, and leading cultivated men to study the Bible at once with freedom

[1] Judgment delivered by the Right Hon. Dr. Lushington, June 25, 1862.

[2] Judgment of the Judicial Committee of Her Majesty's Privy Council, delivered February 8, 1864.

and reverence instead of repelling them by the exhibition of an unreasoning bibliolatry.

In the preparation of his Introduction the author has sought to enter into fellowship with the spiritual men of former times. Recognising the undeniable fact that modes of thought vary from age to age, and that moral sentiments have became more refined with the course of time, he has endeavoured to seize the point of view of the Biblical writers; to apprehend their ideas of God and man; and to estimate aright their doctrinal peculiarities as influenced more or less by their mental characteristics, their early training, and historical position generally. While thus employed, his faith in the infinite love and mercy of the Almighty has been strengthened. May he hope that the perusal of his volumes will have a similar effect on his readers? They are only a small contribution to the study of the New Testament. But if they take their place beside the kindred productions of De Wette, Bleek, Reuss, and Scholten, he will feel that he has done something to promote an intelligent perusal of the Christian records.

The books are treated in chronological order.

April 1868.

LIST OF THE NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS.

	PAGE
The Gospel of Matthew, vol. i.	465
The Gospel of Mark, vol. ii.	76
The Gospel of Luke, vol. ii.	1
The Gospel of John, vol. ii.	323
The Acts, vol. ii.	196
The Epistle to the Romans, vol. i.	117
The First Epistle to the Corinthians, vol. i.	34
The Second Epistle to the Corinthians, vol. i.	66
The Epistle to the Galatians, vol. i.	85
The Epistle to the Ephesians, vol. i.	372
The Epistle to the Philippians, vol. i.	194
The Epistle to the Colossians, vol. i.	168
The First Epistle to the Thessalonians, vol. i.	16
The Second Epistle to the Thessalonians, vol. i.	1
The First Epistle to Timothy, vol. ii.	137
The Second Epistle to Timothy, vol. ii.	130
The Epistle to Titus, vol. ii.	124
The Epistle to Philemon, vol. i.	161
The Epistle to the Hebrews, vol. i.	216
The General Epistle of James, vol. i.	281
The First Epistle of Peter, vol. i.	408
The Second Epistle of Peter, vol. ii.	469
The First Epistle General of John, vol. ii.	291
The Second and Third Epistles of John, vol. ii.	313
The General Epistle of Jude, vol. i.	440
The Revelation, vol. i.	313

CONTENTS

OF

THE FIRST VOLUME.

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS

PAGE

Origin of the Church at Thessalonica—Occasion, object, and date of the Epistle—Contents—Authenticity . . . 1

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS

Date and place—Immediate occasion and object—Contents—Authenticity—Comparison of the Thessalonian Epistles with the Acts of the Apostles—Their order—Commentaries 16

THE FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

Origin of the Church at Corinth—Occasion of the Epistle—Time and place of writing—State of the Church when Paul wrote—The Apostle's visits to the Corinthians before he wrote to them—A lost Epistle addressed to them—Authenticity—Contents 34

THE SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS

Account of the Apostle between the writing of the First and Second extant Epistles—Effects of the First Epistle on the Church at Corinth—Occasion and object—Time and place—Unity and integrity—Diction and style—Authenticity—Contents—Commentaries . . . 66

THE EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS

PAGE

Introduction of Christianity among the Galatians—Time and place at which the Letter was written—The Apostle's adversaries in the Churches—State of the Churches when visited by Paul a second time — Composition of the Churches — Authenticity — Contents — Interpretation of iv. 21–27; iii. 16—Commentaries 85

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS

Origin of the Church—Composition of the Church when Paul wrote—His object or design—Time and place—Authenticity—Integrity — Language — Contents—Paragraphs interpreted, chap. v. 12–19; vii. 7–25 — Commentaries 117

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON

Person to whom the Letter was addressed—Occasion of it—Time and place—Authenticity — Contents — Commentaries 161

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS

Colosse and its Church—Who planted it—Authenticity—Errors combated — Occasion and object — Time and place — Contents — The Epistle from Laodicea—Commentaries 168

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS

Some circumstances connected with Philippi—Authenticity —Unity—Number of Philippian Epistles—Time and place—State of the Church — Occasion and object—Peculiarities in the commencement and conclusion—Contents—Commentaries 194

THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS

Authorship—Time and place—Persons addressed—Language—Occasion and object—Contents—Commentaries 216

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES

PAGE
General observations on the collection 279

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES

The Author—Persons addressed—Time and place of writing —Authenticity—Leading object—Characteristics of the writer and readers—Language and style—Contents—Commentaries 281

THE REVELATION

Authorship—Time and place—Class of writings it belongs to—The Apostle's object—General structure—Contents —Canonicity and value—Schemes of interpretation—Errors of expositors—Commentaries 313

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS

Notices of Ephesus and its first connection with the Christian religion—Persons addressed—Authenticity—Time and place—Occasion and object—Contents—Commentaries 372

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER

Notices of alleged Author—Authenticity—Time and place —Persons addressed—Object—General character, style, and diction—Contents—Commentaries 408

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE

Authorship—Authenticity—Time and place—Persons addressed—Occasion and object—Contents—Commentaries 440

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON THE GOSPELS

Their mutual relation 451

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW

PAGE

Alleged Author—Persons for whom intended—Original language—Apostolicity—Analysis of contents—Characteristics—Leading object—Time of writing—Style and diction—Quotations from the Old Testament—Commentaries 465

INTRODUCTION

TO

THE NEW TESTAMENT.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT THESSALONICA.

THESSALONICA, on the site of the ancient Therma, was built at the mouth of the river Echedorus on the Thermaic gulf, and was so named by Cassander after his wife. At the time of the Roman dominion it was large, populous, and wealthy, the metropolis of the second part of Macedonia, the seat of a Roman president and quæstor. Many Jews resided there on account of its favourable situation for trade.

Paul visited it on his second missionary tour, in company with Silas, perhaps Timothy also, soon after he entered Europe, and found the usual synagogue of the Jews (Acts xvii. 1). Considerable success attended his preaching. It is true that some only of the Jews believed, but numbers of proselytes, and many women of distinction, united themselves to him (xvii. 4). Gentiles converted directly from heathenism were added; so that the body of the converts consisted of Gentiles. A large church was gathered, to which very few of Jewish extraction belonged, as we infer from 1 Thess. i. 9.

The historian in the Acts, speaks of the apostle resorting to the synagogue three Sabbath days; from which some conclude that he stayed at Thessalonica only three weeks. But the idea of a longer abode is favoured by Phil. iv. 16 and 1 Thess. ii. 9: 'For even in Thessalonica ye sent once and again unto my necessity. . . . For ye remember, brethren, our labour and travail: for labouring night and day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the gospel of God.' It cannot be that these repeated supplies from Philippi belong to a later visit which Paul made to Thessalonica, when he fled from Ephesus (Acts xxi. 1, &c.) as Olshausen supposes, for the context is adverse. They were sent to him *in the beginning of the gospel, when he departed from Macedonia* (iv. 15); that is, when he published the gospel among the heathen, at the time of his leaving Macedonia; which can only refer to his first visit to Thessalonica. It is likely that the unbelieving Jews drove him away from the synagogue to another place at the end of three weeks; so that he continued a little longer. Yet his stay was short; and he could not instruct the believers fully in the doctrines and duties of Christianity. De Wette supposes, with great probability, that his preaching took in the main an apocalyptic tendency; that is, it turned on the coming of Christ as a ruler; the leading ideas incorporated in his teaching being connected with that topic. The charges of the Jews agree with this: they are political. Paul and his associates are accused of acting contrary to the decrees of Caesar, and setting up another king, one Jesus (Acts xvii. 7). The envy and opposition of the Jews, as well as other circumstances, show that the minds of the Thessalonians had been forcibly impressed with the truth in question.

Compelled to leave Thessalonica, Paul and Silvanus went to Berea, whither Thessalonian Jews followed. It would also seem, that Timothy, who had remained at

Thessalonica, rejoined Paul at Berea (comp. Acts xvii. 10 and 14; 2 Thess. i. 1). After the Jews had caused the apostle to leave Berea, he was conducted to the sea, and sailed for Athens, Silas and Timothy remaining behind. The returning messengers who attended him, had orders for Timothy and Silas to rejoin him at Athens. From the capital of Attica he repaired to Corinth for the first time. Timothy rejoined the apostle at Athens (Acts xvii. 15); Silas remained at Berea. But the state of the converts at Thessalonica caused him to send Timothy to them from Athens (1 Thess. iii. 1, 2). Some critics suppose that Paul sent Timothy from Berea to visit the Thessalonians. But the words of 1 Thess. iii. 1, 2, favour the other view. Silas, as well as Timothy, rejoined the apostle at Athens.

OCCASION, OBJECT, AND DATE.

The epistle was written from Berea, after Timothy had rejoined the apostle. The writer expresses satisfaction with the state of the Thessalonian church. Their faith and love had increased. They were enduring present persecutions patiently—a fact showing enmity on the part of the Jews. Their state of mind, however, respecting the coming of Christ was restless, because they thought that event at hand. The apostle had therefore received intelligence from Thessalonica by Timothy.

His leading object was to instruct the believers respecting the Lord's coming, and so to rectify the error they had fallen into. We learn his main purpose from chapter ii. 1–12, where he states that the event was not so near as many supposed, but that Antichrist must first appear and exert a mighty influence. He cautions them against being shaken or troubled in spirit, either by prophecies, or pretended instruction, or letter purporting to proceed from him. An epistle was forged in

the apostle's name; and expressions he had uttered were distorted. The effects of this were most prejudicial to the spiritual interests of the believers at Thessalonica. We know nothing of the pretended letter, by whom it was written, or with what motive. Probably the intention of it was to quiet their minds respecting the second advent, though the effect proved opposite; for an enthusiastic tendency was produced, and false apprehensions created. Fears were excited, especially in such as were conscious of their sins. Hence the apostle thought it needful to set them right. This was his main object. A more general one was to instruct, console, and admonish.

If these remarks be correct, Paley's arguments in defence of that explanation of ii. 2, which excludes allusion to one or more forged letters, are erroneous. We do not believe that the passage relates to 1 Thess. iv. 15–17, and v. 4, being intended to rectify a misconception put upon Paul's words. The language 'as from us,' i.e. purporting to proceed from us, has an application beyond the first letter. The date of the present epistle is about A.D. 52. It is not necessary to suppose that it was the first of Paul's epistles, as others prior in date may have been lost. It is the earliest extant.

CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts: i. 3–12; ii. 1–17; iii. 1–18.

1. After an introduction, the writer thanks God for the progress of the Thessalonian believers in faith and love, as well as their steadfastness amid persecution. He had often spoken of them in commendation, and assures them that though persecuted now, they should be recompensed at the coming of Christ, while their enemies would be overthrown. It was his continual prayer to God that they might persevere, and become

complete in the Christian character, that the name of the Lord might be glorified in them (i. 3–12).

2. He warns them against the notion that the day of the Lord is just at hand, on which point they had been needlessly agitated; and shows the groundlessness of their fears. The Man of Sin and Son of Perdition was first to appear, and sit in the temple of God. Though the mystery of iniquity had begun to work, there was a restraining influence. After the removal of that barrier Antichrist would be revealed in all his ungodliness, to be signally destroyed. The apostle, however, thanks God that the Thessalonians had been chosen to salvation, admonishing them to stand fast by the instructions he had given, and praying that they might do so by divine help (ii.).

3. He requests his readers to pray for him, that he might be successful in spreading Christianity throughout the world, and be preserved from the malice of the wicked Jews. He again expresses his confidence in them, and good wishes on their behalf, annexing a command respecting the idle and disorderly, that the true believers should withdraw from their society. He reminds them of his own example, stating that he had worked with his hands for a subsistence among them, although he had power to require support. Should these persons not amend, he counsels the others to discountenance them, and use the most likely methods of bringing about repentance. The epistle concludes with a salutation written with his own hand, to serve as a mark of authenticity, distinguishing his letters from such forgeries as those referred to in the epistle itself (iii.).

AUTHENTICITY.

External evidence sufficiently attests the letter's authenticity. Polycarp writes (after A.D. 147 and before 167):—'Be ye also moderate in this, and do not count

such as enemies, but call them back, as suffering and erring members' (2 Thess. iii. 15).[1]

The epistle of Polycarp to the church at Philippi is authentic, with the exception of interpolated passages in the 3rd, 9th, 13th, and perhaps other chapters. The allusions to Ignatius and his epistles are obviously later.[2] Hence it must be used with discretion as evidence for the New Testament books.

Justin Martyr (†160 or 166) seems to refer to it in these words : 'When also the man of apostasy, who, speaking great things against the Most High, shall dare to commit lawless deeds against us Christians on the earth, &c.'[3] It must be admitted, however, that the reference of these words to the Thessalonian epistle is doubtful. As Justin never mentions Paul nor quotes him expressly, but ascribes the honour of a mission to the Gentiles to the twelve apostles exclusively, he may not have known Paul's epistles, or may have ignored them if he did. His views were in many respects opposed to Paul's, and allied to those of the Jewish Christians who rejected flesh offered to idols and were addicted to millennarianism. The coincidences which Otto has pointed out between his language and that of the Pauline epistles are very uncertain; nor is there any proof that the apostle of the Gentiles had helped to mould his faith and language, as has been asserted. Probably he knew, but ignored his letters; attributing no apostolic authority to them after the example of the Jewish Christians. As to the agreement between Justin

[1] Sobrii ergo estote; et non sicut inimicos tales existimetis, sed sicut passibilia membra et errantia eos revocate, ut omnium vestrum corpus salvetis.—*Ad Philipp.* c. ii.

[2] Hilgenfeld, Apost. Väter, p. 273; Ritschl, Altkatholische Kirche, Anhang, p. 585, *et seq.* 2nd ed.; and Volkmar, Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien, p. 43, *et seq.*

[3] "Οταν καὶ ὁ τῆς ἀποστασίας ἄνθρωπος, ὁ καὶ εἰς τὸν ὕψιστον ἔξαλλα λαλῶν, ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς ἄνομα το\μήσῃ εἰς ἡμᾶς τοὺς Χριστιανούς, · κ.τ.λ. —*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 371, ed. Thirlby.

and Paul in their common quotations from the Septuagint, which has been adduced as evidence of the influence of the latter upon the former, it is explained by the fact that the text of that version had been altered between the time of Paul and Justin after the Hebrew original and Paul's quotations. The Christians had been compelled to amend the version—as they believed, on account of their disputes with the Jews who found fault with it.

Irenaeus (177–192) writes: 'And again in the second epistle to the Thessalonians, speaking of Antichrist, "And then shall the wicked one be revealed, whom the Lord Jesus Christ shall slay with the breath of his mouth, and destroy with the presence of his coming; even him whose coming is after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders."'[1]

Tertullian (†220–240) has this language: 'And in the second epistle to the same persons he [Paul] writes with greater solicitude, "But I beseech you brethren, by the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye be not soon shaken in mind, nor be troubled,"' &c.[2]

Clement of Alexandria (†220) writes: 'And the apostle says, "There is not in every man that knowledge. But pray ye that we may be delivered from unreasonable and wicked men, for all men have not faith."'[3]

It is also in the old Syriac (about 200), the old Latin (170), and the canon of Muratori (180). Marcion's list (about 140) had it.

[1] Et iterum in secunda ad Thessalonicenses, de antichristo dicens, Et tunc revelabitur iniquus quem Dominus Jesus Christus interficiet spiritu oris sui, et destruet praesentia adventus sui, illum cujus est adventus secundum operationem Satanae, in omni virtute et signis, et portentis mendacii.—*Adv. Haeres.* iii. 7. 2.

[2] Et in secunda, pleniore sollicitudine ad eosdem, Obsecro autem vos, fratres, per adventum Domini nostri Jesu Christi, et congregationem nostram ad illum, ne cito commoveamini animo, neque turbemini, &c. —*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 24.

[3] Οὐκ ἐν πᾶσι, φησὶν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἡ γνῶσις· προσεύχεσθε δὲ ἵνα ῥυσθῶμεν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀτόπων καὶ πονηρῶν ἀνθρώπων· οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἡ πίστις. —*Stromata*, v. p. 554.

The second epistle has been more objected to than the first on internal grounds. Schmidt led the way, and was followed by Kern.[1] Baur enlarged and sharpened Kern's arguments.[2] Hilgenfeld[3] has taken the same side. Noack,[4] like Baur, rejects both epistles. The following is a summary of the arguments used.

1. Hilgenfeld asserts that the eschatology of the epistle goes beyond that of the first, the second advent being put farther back than in the other. This is compatible with identity of authorship, as Baur admits; for the same writer may speak from different points of view at different times, relative to the subject.

2. 'The salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle,' betrays a consciousness of literary frauds, which the apostle himself could not have suspected. How could such a notice attest the authenticity of an epistle which was either the first, or one of the first he wrote?

A spurious epistle was already in circulation at Thessalonica (ii. 2), and therefore an autographic subscription is a legitimate token of authenticity. The same autograph salutation occurs in 1 Cor. xvi. 21, and Coloss. iv. 18.

3. The epistle has unpauline expressions, as *to count worthy of the calling, to fulfil all the good pleasure of his goodness* (i. 11),[5] the *and* before '*for this reason*' (ii. 11),[6] the word for *chosen* (ii. 13).[7] To these may be added the exaggerated, *your faith groweth exceedingly, and the charity of every one of you all toward each other aboundeth* (i. 3),[8] the far-fetched *our testimony*

[1] In the Tübingen Zeitschrift for 1839, Heft 2.

[2] Paulus der Apostel u. s. w., p. 480, *et seq.*

[3] Zeitschrift, vol. v. p. 225, *et seq.*

[4] Ursprung des Christenthums, vol. ii. p. 313, *et seq.*

[5] ἀξιωῦν τῆς κλήσεως, πληροῦν πᾶσαν εὐδοκίαν ἀγαθωσύνης.

[6] καὶ διὰ τοῦτο.

[7] εἵλατο.

[8] ὑπεραυξάνει ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν, καὶ πλεονάζει ἡ ἀγάπη ἑνὸς ἑκάστου πάντων ὑμῶν εἰς ἀλλήλους.

among you was believed (i. 10),[1] *and to receive the love of the truth* (ii. 10).[2] The word *calling*[3] is used of the future, meaning the heavenly happiness of God's children (i. 11), whereas Paul knows of no other calling than that made by the gospel in the past. The word *Lord* (iii. 3)[4] departs from Pauline usage, in which it means God only, not Christ.

Little weight can be attached to a few expressions of this sort affecting mere composition. Some of them are hardly correct, for example what Hilgenfeld says of the term *calling*, which properly means 'a call to the privileges of the kingdom of God,' including both past and future in the one idea. And *the Lord*[5] does not always mean Christ in Paul's writings (except in quotations from the Old Testament); it means God himself in various instances, as in Rom. xiv. 6–8. Both Thessalonian epistles contain fewer peculiarities of language than any of Paul's. Their diction is less laboured than that of the later ones, less parenthetic and abrupt. The syntax is more regular, and the accumulation of words less apparent. The apostle's manner is calmer and more placid, his language less vigorous and exuberant. All this is natural. He wrote more simply in the beginning of his ministry. Yet his passionate nature still appears in the language of i. 3, and elsewhere.

4. The second epistle, it is said, is only an excerpt or repetition of the first. Surely this does not apply to 1 Thess. ii. 1–12, which finds no echo in the second epistle. Nor is the doctrine of Antichrist contained in the first epistle (2. ii. 1–10). The objection derives most of its plausibility from the first chapter of the second epistle, and from ii. 13–17. In opposition to this idea of the dependence of the writer of the second epistle, which Baur has put forward very prominently, we are

[1] ἐπιστεύθη τὸ μαρτύριον ἡμῶν ἐφ' ὑμᾶς.
[2] τὴν ἀγάπην τῆς ἀληθείας δεξάσθαι.
[3] κλῆσις. [4] κύριος. [5] ὁ κύριος. Comp. ii. 13.

inclined to believe that the writer has repeated and amplified himself in the first epistle. Thus the afflictions referred to in the first chapter of the second epistle are explained by 1 ep. ii., where we see that Jews were the persecutors. The faith, love and patience of 2 Thess. i. 3, 4, are enlarged into 'work of faith and labour of love and patience of hope' in 1 Thess. i. 3; and 'the unreasonable and wicked men' from whom the apostle wishes to be delivered (2 Thess. iii. 2) are more particularly specified in 1 Thess. ii. 14–16.

5. The view given of the future in the epistles is attacked. Critics allege that it originated in a special interest in the doctrine of the second advent. It is allowed, however, that the author attaches himself generally to the ideas of 1 Cor. xv. 51, 52, while he follows out his own doctrinal object. But according to Baur, there is a contradiction between 1 Cor. xv. 52 and 2 Thess. ii. 2. Such diving into the unrevealed future concerning Christ's coming is pronounced unpauline.

In writing to different churches under different circumstances and with different objects, it is natural that the same topic should be treated differently. The apocalyptic subject introduced into the Thessalonian epistles is certainly new in all essential features, being merely touched upon elsewhere. But it has its roots in the Old Testament, especially in the book of Daniel. The contradiction discovered by Baur is, that in the Corinthian epistle, the writer expects to survive the second advent, and to be changed with the living; while in the second to the Thessalonians, the great event is postponed till after Antichrist, beyond the lifetime of the apostle.

As St. Paul had no special revelation of future events, we cannot expect him to announce a fixed opinion about the second coming of Christ. He did not know when it was to be, whether in his own day or not. If he interposes Antichrist before that event in the Thessalonian

epistles, and withdraws the idea again, why should it be thought a strange thing? When he projected his thoughts into the unknown future of the church or the world, it was not likely that they should assume the same definite shape at all times. Why withhold latitude of view from him, especially in relation to the shadowy subject of the circumstances attendant upon the second advent, its comparative nearness, and its signs ?

6. The great argument against the authenticity of the second epistle is derived from ii. 1–12, in which the doctrine of Antichrist is developed—a doctrine pronounced unpauline. Here Kern, Hilgenfeld, and Baur have expended great ingenuity. Even Zeller supposes, that the writer draws his view from the Apocalypse.

A good deal depends on the interpretation of the passage. If Antichrist be Nero, *he that withholds* Vespasian, and the *apostasy* or *falling away*, the fall of both Jews and Christians, as Kern believes; the argument against authenticity is valid. If the description of the wicked one 'sitting in the temple of God' means 'enthroned within Christianity,' and therefore consists with the destruction of the temple at the time, we may with Hilgenfeld apply the passage to the time of Trajan. But neither opinion is necessarily derived from the paragraph, which is capable of an interpretation in harmony with Pauline authorship. All admit the difficulty. The discussions to which the passage has given rise are numerous. Dragged as it has been into theological controversy, Protestants and Romanists have wasted labour upon it.

Instead of enumerating opinions, a list of which may be found in De Wette, we shall briefly indicate the writer's meaning.

The doctrine of Antichrist had its origin in Judaism, especially in the book of Daniel. The appearance of a personal enemy to Messiah, the incarnation of all evil, was a rabbinical belief.

The first form of the Antichristian idea in connection with the new religion, is observable in the 24th chapter of Matthew. False Christs and false prophets should arise, leading the Christians astray by means of lying wonders and signs. The antichristian power was to proceed from the bosom of Judaism. Experience soon developed and expanded the idea. As the Roman power showed no friendly aspect towards Christianity, the early believers began to think that heathenism would also contribute to the manifestation of Antichrist. Nero's persecution was the chief cause of this, as we see in the Revelation, where the representative of heathenism embodied in the Roman empire is the personification of Antichrist. A third, and ultimate stage of the idea as far as the New Testament is concerned, appears in the epistles of John. Teachers arose within the Christian Church, who denied the proper humanity of Christ: i.e. his Messiahship. Accordingly, several Antichrists are spoken of, various adversaries who denied all that was vital.

It is not easy to identify the apostle's doctrine with any of these phases. It is not the same as the Apocalyptic doctrine. The whole idea of Antichrist is there transferred to heathenism, and the description is more detailed. The self-deification in the Revelation consists in the second beast offering worship to the first (chap. xiii.). Probably Paul thought of Judaism producing Antichrist. His language in 1 Thess. ii. 15, 16, is in harmony with that. The great enemy of Christ was to proceed from the bosom of that system. Gfroerer[1] has shown that this is a tenable view; and Schneckenburger himself cannot but concede that germs of the idea of Antichrist are observable in ante-christian Judaism. The state of Palestine would strengthen such an idea, where the Jewish rebellion was restrained from its full

[1] Das Jahrhundert des Heils, ii. pp. 256, 300, 405, &c.

outburst by the Roman power. The future Antichrist would complete what Agrippa had already begun (Acts xii. 21–23). Judaism, which had rejected the Messiah, might well give rise to his demoniacal antitype. In any case, Jerusalem was still standing when the epistle was written, as is implied in the existence of the temple (ii. 4); for Hilgenfeld's interpretation to the contrary is incorrect. We are thus led to put the ideas of the writer before the second stage of the doctrine when Antichrist was looked for in heathenism; to the first phase of it, when Judaism was thought to be the parent of the great enemy. If again we compare the discourse in Matthew xxiv., we find a difference. There false prophets and false Christs appear. The 'abomination of desolation' stands in the most holy place. Here the description is more definite. The 'Man of Sin' is a single person. He sits in the temple of God, and gives himself out as God. Hence we place the phase of the antichristian idea that appears in the epistle, between the first and second stage of its development, while Judaism was regarded as the cradle of the monster.

The writer's description might *possibly* be assigned to the second stage of development, when heathenism was considered the mother of Antichrist, rather than Judaism. If we could suppose, with Hitzig, that 'what withholdeth' is Claudius, we should be brought at once to the reign of that emperor. Then would Claudius[1] be the bar, preventing the next emperor from completing what Caligula had begun. But the interpretation is too precarious to be adopted. As we expound the passage, it contains the peculiar ideas of the apostle himself about Antichrist, not a prophecy of what was, or is to be hereafter; and it is as vain to look for the realisation of those ideas in the future history of the Church as it has been to find it in Romanism, or to identify the Man of

[1] Qui claudit.

Sin with the pope. The writer himself entertained no opinion resembling that of persons who are groping for Antichrist in the ecclesiastical life of churches and sects, or postponing his appearance to an indefinite future. The Man of Sin is an ideal personage of the first and second centuries, embodying certain conceptions, whose complexion changed with the current of events—the concentrated essence of that enmity to Christ, which the imagination of the early Christians grouped around a person, however variously his origin was conceived of. Or he is represented by various false teachers, who left the bosom of the church, and undermined the personality of Christ by docetic views. The antichristian power fluctuated between a plurality of persons and one, according to the conceptions of different periods.

The Man of Sin then, is not to precede the coming of the Lord. No being of gigantic intellect is prophetically described by the apostle. Nor is any system, Judaism, Romanism, or Protestantism, shadowed forth. Preterists and futurists are equally in error, while seeking the fulfilment in history. The passage does not contain a prophecy, but rather the writer's notions on a subject which did not concern the proper faith and duty of mankind. Those notions were shaped by the floating belief of his day; and have nothing beyond a historical interest. They belong to the past of Christianity—to its infantine state when it was emerging out of Judaism, and assuming that independent position to which no man contributed so much as the apostle of the Gentiles.

These remarks are entirely consistent with the apostle's inspiration, though not with that view of it which converts it into an infallible thing. Inspiration did not lift men above error. It did not confer upon them the attribute of infallibility. They were still peccable men, but possessing the Spirit of God in a remarkable degree, and gifted with peculiar insight into His mind. Their own subjectivity mingled with, and formed part of,

their inspiration. We take them as guides to faith and practice generally, without adopting all that they propounded, or believing that they could foretell future events. Against the supposed unpauline marks, should be set numerous resemblances in manner and phraseology to the apostle's writings, which Jowett has carefully stated.[1] The established authorship will hold its place among New Testament critics, notwithstanding the assaults it has encountered.

[1] The Epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, &c., vol. i. pp. 148, 149.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE THESSALONIANS.

DATE AND PLACE.

IT HAS been already stated that Paul went from Berea to Athens, whither Timothy followed him. From the latter place he sent his faithful friend to the Thessalonians, and departed for Corinth, where he continued for a considerable time, Silvanus rejoining him there. During this abode he thought much about the Thessalonians, and had great anxiety on their account; but as soon as Timothy returned from his Macedonian journey with a favourable report of the church, he resolved to send a second epistle. Hence the date is about A.D. 53, at Corinth. It may have been written six months later than the former one. The language of chap. i. 7, 8 agrees with this, where the Thessalonians are said to be patterns to all who believe in Macedonia and Achaia.

IMMEDIATE OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The account of the church brought by Timothy gave rise to the epistle. The apostle learnt from his messenger that the members had remained steadfast though exposed to persecution; and that their zeal had been an example to many. But some circumstances were less cheering. An enthusiastic expectation of Christ's immediate return still led to neglect of their worldly calling, as well as to undue depreciation of prophecy. Hence their spiritual parent thought it needful to address another letter to them. The object

he had in view was to encourage and admonish; to encourage them in continued steadfastness, and admonish them concerning things they ought to abandon. He confirms and comforts them, enjoining them to act differently in some respects, to be holy, diligent, and humble, walking worthy of their high calling.

It is far from the truth to say with Macknight, that the apostle wished to furnish the Thessalonians with a formal proof of the gospel's divine original, and a refutation of the objections made to it by the learned Greeks and philosophers.

CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into two parts, chaps. i.–iii. and iv. v. The first of these contains the free utterances of the apostle's heart to the Thessalonian believers respecting their state, his reception among them, his affectionate solicitude on their behalf, and the joy he felt from the good report he had received. The second consists of various admonitions and exhortations relative to their moral condition, administers comfort about the fate of deceased friends at the coming of Christ, warns them to be always ready for that event, and concludes with general counsels.

1. After an introductory salutation, the writer speaks of his continued thanksgiving to God for the faith, love, and hope of the Christians at Thessalonica. He praises them for their prompt reception of the truth, though they were in circumstances of great trial; and speaks of the honour they had in sending forth the gospel into neighbouring countries. They forsook their idolatry so cheerfully as to be an example to others (i. 1–10).

He reminds them of his first appearance at Thessalonica, that he had been anxious solely for their spiritual welfare, supporting himself by the toil of his hands and burthensome to none; so that his conduct among

them had been characterised by kindness, benevolence, and disinterested affection. He also reminds them of the counsels he had given respecting holiness. After this he praises God again for their willing reception of the gospel, and their steadfast endurance of all the persecutions which had befallen them (ii. 1–16).

The apostle utters his longing to see them again, remarking that he had attempted to return to them several times, but had been hindered. Meanwhile he had sent Timothy to establish and comfort them. By this faithful attendant he had received a pleasing account of their state, which was an unspeakable comfort amid all his discouragements; and therefore he thanks God, beseeching Him to increase their faith and love (ii. 17–iii. 13).

2. Paul exhorts them to purity of conduct, brotherly love, and a quiet, orderly pursuit of their daily avocations (iv. 1–12). Coming to eschatology, he instructs them respecting the resurrection of the dead at Christ's reappearance, showing that the deceased would not be deprived of the benefits of Messiah's reign, but be favoured with their Lord's immediate presence simultaneously with the living. As to the time of Christ's coming, he remarks that it will be sudden, so that they should be always prepared. They ought to be awake and sober, as children of the day (iv. 13–v. 11).

He counsels them to respect those who presided over them, and to be at peace among themselves; to warn the disorderly, to comfort the feeble in faith, to be patient towards all; to return nothing but good for evil; to be ever contented and happy; to be frequent in prayer and praise; not to repress the spiritual gifts which some of them had received, nor to despise prophesyings as the offspring of enthusiasm, but to prove all the inspirations of the prophets and retain only what is good. They are to abstain from all sin, and to practise universal righteousness, to which he subjoins

the appropriate prayer, that God would sanctify them, body, soul, and spirit. In conclusion, he requests their prayers, sends his salutations, and solemnly adjures them to read the letter in public, which is succeeded by the usual benediction (v. 12–28).

AUTHENTICITY.

The allusions to the epistle in the so-called apostolic fathers are indistinct, though given without hesitation by Lardner and Kirchhofer. In the epistle of Clement of Rome (between 100 and 125) we read: 'We ought in all things to give thanks to Him' (1 Thess. v. 18).[1] 'Let our whole body therefore be saved in Christ Jesus' (1 Thess. v. 23).[2] These allusions are indistinct. In the epistles to Ignatius we find: 'Devote yourselves to unceasing prayers' (1 Thess. v. 17).[3] 'Pray also for other men without ceasing' (v. 17).[4] The word 'unceasing' is absent from the Syriac in both places. Neither the seven Greek, nor the three Syriac epistles, i.e. those to the Ephesians, Romans, and Polycarp, can be reckoned authentic, the latter being an extract from the former. All are posterior to Ignatius himself, who was not thrown to the wild beasts in the amphitheatre at Rome by command of Trajan, but at Antioch on December 20, A.D. 115. The epistles were written after 150 A.D.

Polycarp writes: 'Making intercession for all without ceasing' (v. 17);[5] 'Abstaining from all iniquity' (v. 22).[6]

The authenticity is clearly attested by Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria.

[1] Ὀφείλομεν κατὰ πάντα εὐχαριστεῖν αὐτῷ.—*Ep. ad Corinth.* c. 38.

[2] Σωζέσθω οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.—*Ibid.*

[3] Προσευχαῖς σχόλαζε ἀδιαλείπτοις.—*Ad Polycarp.* i.

[4] Καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄλλων δὲ ἀνθρώπων ἀδιαλείπτως προσεύχεσθε.—*Ad Ephes.* c. 10.

[5] Ἐντυγχανούσας ἀδιαλείπτως περὶ πάντων.—*Ad Philipp.* c. 4.

[6] Ἀπεχόμενοι πάσης ἀδικίας.—*Ibid.* c. 2.

Irenaeus writes: 'And on this account the apostle explaining his own meaning has set forth the perfect and spiritual man of salvation, speaking thus in the first epistle to the Thessalonians: "And may the God of peace sanctify you wholly, and your entire spirit, soul, and body be kept without complaint till the advent of the Lord Jesus Christ"' (v. 23).[1]

Tertullian says: 'And therefore the majesty of the Holy Spirit, which discerns such senses, suggests in the epistle to the Thessalonians itself: "But of the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that I write unto you; for yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord will come as a thief in the night,"' &c. (v. 1, &c.)[2]

Clement of Alexandria writes: 'This the blessed Paul plainly signified, saying: "When we might have been burdensome as apostles of Christ, we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children"' (ii. 7).[3]

The epistle was in Marcion's canon. It is also in the old Latin and Syriac versions as well as the Muratorian fragment.

The chief opponent of the epistle's authenticity is Baur, whose arguments are marked by his usual acuteness. They are in substance the following.

1. Among all the Pauline letters none is so far behind the rest in the peculiar nature and importance

[1] Et propter hoc apostolus seipsum exponens, explanavit perfectum et spiritualem salutis hominem, in prima epistola ad Thessalonicenses dicens sic: Deus autem pacis sanctificet vos perfectos, et integer vester spiritus et anima et corpus sine querela in adventum Domini Jesu Christi servetur.—*Adv. Haeres.* v. 6. i.

[2] Et ideo majestas Spiritus Sancti perspicax ejusmodi sensuum et in ipsa ad Thessalonicenses epistola suggerit: De temporibus autem et temporum spatiis, fratres, non est necessitas scribendi vobis. Ipsi enim certissime scitis, quod dies Domini, quasi fur nocte, ita adveniet, &c. —*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. 24.

[3] Τοῦτό τοι σαφέστατα ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ὑπεσημήνατο, εἰπών· δυνάμενοι ἐν βαρεῖ εἶναι ὡς Χριστοῦ ἀπόστολοι, ἐγενήθημεν ἤπιοι ἐν μέσῳ ὑμῶν, ὡς ἂν τροφὸς θάλπῃ τὰ ἑαυτῆς τέκνα.—*Paedagog.* i. p. 88 (ed. Sylburg.).

of its contents. Not a single doctrinal idea is prominently adduced, except that in iv. 13–18. The contents consist of general instructions, admonitions, wishes, which are merely subordinate and secondary in the Pauline epistles. The unimportant nature of the materials, the absence of special interests, and of a reasonable motive for writing, testify an unpauline origin.

If the contents of the epistle correspond to the known circumstances and wants of the church at Thessalonica, the critic should be satisfied, provided they do not contradict ascertained Pauline characteristics. Should the didactic and doctrinal element be overpowered by the hortatory, may not the relations between Paul and the church account for it? We should look to historical circumstances for the origin and character of the letter, not to abstract considerations of Christian doctrine. Expectation of Christ's immediate advent seems to have had a great effect on the church. Laying hold of their minds, it gave rise to various related questions, which furnished one reason at least for the apostle's writing. The topic does not indeed form the body of the letter, but it is a part of it, not unimportant. The apostle himself expected the speedy advent of Christ, as we learn from 1 Cor. xv. He had preached it to this Gentile community, and it had produced an important practical effect upon them. The state of the converts in relation to it was one cause of his writing, and some of the general admonitions were prompted by the influence which the belief had upon their daily life. If the doctrinal element in the epistle recedes behind the practical, and if the latter take the form of general exhortations, the departure from Paul's accustomed mode can only be attributed to the circumstances of the case. All the churches which the apostle planted or wrote epistles to, were not alike. If they were not, why should his letters be cast in an uniform mould? It may therefore be granted that the epistle is meagre

compared with those addressed to the Romans or Corinthians, without detriment to its authenticity. Can we expect the apostle to write such epistles as the Corinthian and Roman ones to all other churches?

2. The chief contents of the letter are nothing but an extended explanation of the circumstances attending the conversion of the Thessalonians, which they themselves already knew, and which we know from the Acts of the Apostles. The author of the letter may either have drawn his materials direct from the book of the Acts, or from another source. Thus, i. 4, &c., only tells how the apostle preached the gospel to them and how they received it. In ii. 1 there is a more definite allusion to the circumstances in which the apostle had visited Thessalonica, and the way he had laboured among them; iii. 1 relates what had taken place shortly before, which the Thessalonians already knew. There is throughout a reference to things with which the readers were familiar, as the author himself shows by the recurring verb *know*. (i. 4; ii. 1, 2, 9, 11; iii. 3, 4; iv. 2.)

It should be recollected that the history of the conversion of the Thessalonians is only a part of the letter, not the substance of it; that the writer's references to that event were meant to strengthen them in the faith; that the appeal to what they knew already comes from a soul filled with the remembrance of his presence among them; that the agreement of the account of their conversion with that in the Acts is an argument *for* rather than *against* the Pauline authorship, especially as it is not literal but free, as though it originated in independent authorship.

According to Hilgenfeld, iii. 1–6 is even out of harmony with Acts xvii.: how then can the latter be the source of the former? Should harmony and discordance form an equal argument against authenticity?

3. The passage ii. 14–16, is said by Baur to have an

unpauline stamp. The language about the Jews is certainly stronger than that of the apostle elsewhere, and breathes a different spirit from the epistle to the Romans. Hatred of the human race is attributed to them. Does not his description of them suit their actual relation toward all who were not Jews? They hindered the salvation of the Gentiles; and the writer had just been treated most severely by his countrymen in Thessalonica and Berea. The words, 'wrath has come upon them to the uttermost,' show that in the political state of the Jews at that time the apostle clearly foresaw their future ruin. From the process which had begun he divined their total destruction. The phraseology, 'to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved,' at which Baur stumbles, unpauline as he says it is, and borrowed from the Acts (xiv. 1; xvi. 6, 32; xviii. 9), is nearly analogous to 2 Cor. ii. 17. The passage agrees confessedly with the Acts of the Apostles, from which source—a source partly unhistorical according to the critic in the place that supplies material for the present—it is alleged to be taken. But it is not clear that the book in question furnished it.

4. The epistle contains plain reminiscences of other Pauline ones, especially of those to the Corinthians. In proof of this the critic gives i. 5 from 1 Cor. ii. 4; i. 6, from 1 Cor. xi. 1; ii. 4, etc. from 1 Cor. ii. 4, iv. 3, etc., ix. 15, etc., especially 2 Cor. ii. 17, v. 11. The expression *covetousness*, ii. 5, points to 2 Cor. vii. 2; *might have been burdensome*, ii. 6, *would not be chargeable*, ii. 9, point to 2 Cor. xi. 9; and ii. 7 to 1 Cor. iii. 2. In i. 8 the phrase *in every place your faith is spread abroad* resembles Rom. i. 8.

These similarities of thought and expression are too slender to show the dependence of one writer upon another. The circumstances of the Corinthian and Thessalonian churches were not very dissimilar; and the same author may employ the same thoughts and words

in different epistles. The analogies are not marked enough to betray the hand of a copyist, and might be paralleled by similar ones in the epistles to the Galatians and Romans.[1]

5. How can it be said of a newly-founded church, that they were patterns to all the believers in Macedonia and Achaia; that the report of their having received the word of the Lord had gone forth to every place, so that people could relate of them that they had turned from idolatry to the true God (i. 7, &c.)? How could the apostle say, after so short a period, that he had the most earnest longing to see them personally again (ii. 17; iii. 10)? How could the brotherly love of the Thessalonians, manifest to all the brethren in all Macedonia, be celebrated as a general virtue (iv. 9)? Were exhortations to a quiet life of labour, such as are given in iv. 11, 12, so necessary there? These questions are asked by Baur.

The answer to them depends on the right interpretation of the passages, and the assumption of a date not too soon after the church was founded. They are compatible with a year's interval; and all the improbability attaching to them is removed by the supposition that the present letter was the second, not the first.

6. The passage in iv. 14–18 respecting the resurrection of the dead, and the relation of the dead and living to the appearing of Christ, is pronounced unpauline by Baur; who admits, however, that it coincides with 1 Cor. xv. 52, though going far beyond it; and that it could not be urged against the authenticity of the epistle, if such authenticity were better established. The Corinthian passage and the present explain and supplement one another. It was only in the beginning of Christianity, and in an individual church, that the

[1] See Jowett on the Epistles to the Thessalonians, Romans, Galatians, &c., vol. i. p. 23, *et seq.*

destiny of the believers who died before the second advent could disturb the minds of surviving friends, as it did at Thessalonica.

In opposition to the objections against authenticity, the internal evidence that the epistle is St. Paul's is very strong, as stated by Jowett with the ability of a master.

Too much importance is attached by Baur to uniformity of ideas and expressions as evidence of Pauline authorship. He takes four epistles, unquestionably authentic, and forming a group by themselves, as the standard of measurement for groups of later and earlier origin. By this means little room is allowed for growth in the apostle's mind; nor is there latitude for the influence of that wide variety of circumstances through which he passed, of the persevering opponents he had to encounter, or of the local diversities of peoples. Probably an expression of his own throws some light on the character of his preaching at different times. 'Though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more' (2 Cor. v. 16). At one time he had carnal views of Christ. He expected his personal advent as a near event—one which he himself would live to see. So he preached to the Thessalonians, who had been much agitated by the expected crisis. That belief necessarily involved sensuous ideas respecting the nature of his kingdom, which was to be in some sort an earthly one. Further reflection, aided by experience, led the apostle to more spiritual conceptions of Christ and his kingdom. He began to postpone the second coming indefinitely, or to resolve it into a more subjective phenomenon. For such development on the part of the apostle, Baur does not allow sufficient room. Yet nothing is more probable. Surely Paul's mind was susceptible of it. The man who did so much to separate Christianity from the old religion, and bring out its universal aspect—who, finding it a spiritual offshoot of Judaism, raised it up

into an absolute religion divested of Jewish swaddling clothes, was surely a many-sided thinker, whose circle of ideas enlarged with time, becoming purer and higher. Believing so, we are prepared to find in his earliest epistles other ideas and expressions than in his later—less noble perhaps, less refined, not impregnated with the distinctive doctrines evolved out of his contest with Judaising Christians, more elementary and practical, presented in a form less systematic.

The two epistles to the Thessalonians cannot be compared with the four subsequent and larger ones, in richness of thought or importance of contents. Paul does not here appear on the elevated platform of his dialectics and apostolic consciousness, which his struggle with Christian Judaism encroaching on the territory he had won over to the truth, called forth. The ideas expressed by *righteousness*, *justification*, *justify*, the opposition of faith and works, the efficacy of Christ's death, reconciliation to God by means of the Mediator, and kindred doctrines, which are the distinguishing features of his preaching, are absent. One topic is prominent, the return of Christ, an event on which the hopes of Christians in the apostolic time were centred. Such hopes are expressed with a living freshness that finds no parallel except in the Apocalypse. Round this animating subject the interest of the Thessalonians had gathered; and the apostle dwells upon it with instructive fulness. All the amiability of his tender nature for a young church which needed the counsels of their spiritual father amid enthusiastic expectations and severe persecution, presents itself to the reader in an attractive light. He speaks against Jews as the great enemies of himself and the Thessalonians, not Judaising Christians, as afterwards; and foresees their utter destruction. The cross of Christ had not yet filled his soul, in opposition to the works of law or deeds wrought in human strength; nor did the necessity of Christian emancipation from all

Judaism stand out before him in its distinct reality. The progress of events developed these conceptions in full force; but they lay as yet in the background of his mind, waiting evolution.

With such belief, we hesitate to reject the authenticity of the Thessalonian letters, though they may disagree in certain particulars with some of Paul's larger and later ones. The disagreement must be of a peculiar nature to decide their spuriousness. Besides, it is scarcely fair in argument to use diversities and coincidences against authenticity, at one and the same time. Do they not lead in opposite directions, respectively? All the points of contact which these epistles have with the Corinthian ones favour identity of authorship; while the peculiarities that cannot be paralleled in the undoubtedly authentic letters, are the legitimate offspring of an independent mind, capable of progress, and exempt from the necessity of self-repetition.

The opinion of those critics who defend the authenticity of the first epistle but reject that of the second, seems most improbable; and is a mediating view that cannot stand. Both must go together, either in adoption or rejection. Baur is consistent in rejecting them —so is Noack after him; Hilgenfeld will have few followers in maintaining the Pauline origin of the one, and disputing that of the other. Could they only see the passage about the Man of Sin in another light, their scruples might disappear. This has been the great stumbling-block since Kern. Had the writer's views depended on the Apocalypse, they would have assumed a different shape. They may have been prior, and probably were so.

In maintaining the authenticity of the epistles, we are far from thinking that they could not have been written soon after the apostle's death by another in his name. Holtzmann argues,[1] that a writer in the second century

[1] In Bunsen's Bibelwerk, vol. viii.

would hardly make the apostle say what time had falsified, i.e. that he expected to survive the second advent. Something is also said about the clumsy forgeries of the first and second centuries. But we are not aware of any critic who, denying the authenticity, brings the composition much later than A.D. 70, so that the second century has nothing to do with the question. And as to time falsifying the apostle's anticipation, the early Christians universally believed in the immediate advent of Christ. To have made Paul say he did not share that belief, would have been out of harmony with the current opinion, especially as the deniers of the authenticity repudiate the idea of a forger anxious to palm off his production under a Pauline guise. Forgery is a term wholly inapplicable in these cases. Why should a later writer not have made the apostle consistent with himself in the Thessalonian and Corinthian epistles?

COMPARISON OF THE EPISTLES WITH THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES.

It is not easy to bring the epistles into exact correspondence with the Acts of the Apostles, neither is it important. The history of the latter may be supplemented and corrected by the notices of the former.

1. The Thessalonian Christians are represented as Gentiles, who had turned from idolatry. The church was, therefore, of heathen origin. In the Acts we read that some of the Jews believed, and of the devout Greeks a great multitude, and of the chief women not a few, language implying that Jewish proselytes and Jews formed the body of the church, even if the women were Gentiles, which we do not know. This discrepancy can only be removed by supposing the narrative in the Acts partial and incorrect. Incomplete knowledge attributed to the historian will not account for it; his statement is

untrustworthy. The discrepancy is partly solved by the reading in the Acts which inserts *and* before *Greeks* ('both of the devout *and* of the Greeks a great multitude'), but it is too feebly supported to be received, though Lachmann adopts it. The MSS. A. and D. cannot outweigh B. and ℵ.

2. The persecutors of the Thessalonians were their fellow-countrymen, i.e. Gentiles (1 ep. ii. 14), whereas in the Acts Jews were the active adversaries. The discrepancy cannot be removed or lessened by assuming that 'fellow-countrymen' might include many Hellenist Jews. It can only and properly mean heathens. Paley's solution, that though the opposition made to the gospel originated in the enmity of the Jews, the Gentiles carried it out, is not satisfactory, though sanctioned by De Wette.

3. The notices of Silas and Timothy in the Acts and the epistles appear discordant at first sight.

In the Acts, Paul and Silas are together at Thessalonica, and were sent away by night to Berea. No mention is made there of Timothy. From Berea the apostle went to Athens; but Timothy and Silas remained. Those who conducted him to Athens carried back orders that the two companions should join him there. Nothing is said, however, about their going thither; nor do they reappear with the apostle till he is at Corinth, to which place they came from Macedonia (Acts xviii. 5).

The epistles inform us that Timothy and Silas were with Paul when he wrote (1 Thess. i. 1; 2 Thess. i. 1). The first epistle intimates that Paul thought it best to be left alone at Athens, and sent Timothy to Thessalonica. The *we* before 'thought it good' means himself alone, not himself and Silas. Timothy returned with good news.

The accounts may be brought into harmony by supposing that Timothy, who had been left behind at Thessalonica, followed Paul and Silas to Berea, and

that he was sent back with the so-called second letter. Paul went on to Athens, leaving Silas and Timothy at Berea; but though both had orders to follow him speedily to Athens, it seems that only Timothy rejoined him there. From Athens he sent Timothy again to Thessalonica, and went himself to Corinth, where he remained about two years, and where Silas also arrived. After Timothy's return from Thessalonica to Corinth, the apostle wrote the so-called first letter. The Acts pass over Timothy's mission from Athens to Thessalonica; but the omission is attended with no difficulty.

ORDER OF THE EPISTLES.

The epistles themselves leave an impression on the mind, that they were written in the inverse order of their present arrangement. The shorter or second was the first; the longer or first was the second. This was observed by Grotius, though his grounds for the opinion are not satisfactory.

The so-called second relates to the first elements of doctrine and of Christian life in a church; the writer often reminds his readers of what he had told them shortly before (ii. 5; iii. 10). It is true he does the same thing in the so-called first epistle; but there is a difference. In 2 iii. 11 he writes '*we hear* that there are some which walk among you disorderly, working not at all, but are busybodies'; in 1 iv. 11 the parallel runs, 'we beseech you . . . . . that ye study to be quiet and to do your own business, and to work with your own hands, *as we commanded you*,' the former betraying its prior origin by the terms employed. In 2 ii. 2 he beseeches the Thessalonians 'not to be troubled by word, or spirit, or letter as from us, as that the day of Christ is at hand,' language guarding them against oral or written communications, purporting to proceed from him. The existence of a supposititious

letter or letters is clearly assumed. How is this consistent with the fact of his having previously sent a letter in which the day of Christ is said to be at hand? Why does he not allude to it rather than to a forgery in his name? Would he not have mentioned such, had it been written? The explanation given in 2 ii. 2, &c., about the coming of the day of Christ obviates any misconception that might arise; but if the present order of the two epistles be the right one, the language of 2 ii. 2 is strange. Some suppose that the words 'nor by letter as from us' *do* refer to the first epistle; but that necessitates the conclusion that the apostle found it needful to give a subsequent explanation, which amounts to a *correction* of himself.

In 2 iii. 17, 'the salutation of Paul with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle: so I write,' agrees best with the fact of the letter being the first which the apostle wrote to them. He wishes to put a mark of authenticity to it, because a letter forged in his name was in circulation among the Thessalonians. He begins to authenticate his epistles by his own handwriting at the end, and purposes to do so in every one.

These indications of time in the second epistle are confirmed by various particulars in the first.

'For from you sounded out the word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but also in every place your faith to God-ward is spread abroad,' &c. (1 i. 8). This passage intimates that Paul had been in various places after he had founded the church at Thessalonica; not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but many other localities. Are a few months sufficient to account for the extensive diffusion of this report?

'And we beseech you, brethren, to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you,' &c. (1 v. 12). From this passage it appears that elders had been appointed in the church. These were not chosen immediately after the founding

of a church, but after the lapse of some time; as they were not to be novices (1 Tim. iii. 6.)

'But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope' (1 iv. 13). Here Paul comforts the Thessalonians concerning several believers who had died in the interval between their conversion and his writing the epistle. Is it likely that he had to console these Christians, whom he had just gained over to Christianity, for their deceased friends, immediately after his departure? How many members of the church had died in the interval? The fate of those who had departed before the second advent would not excite a lively interest till the number of such as deceased without living to see what all hoped to witness, was considerable.

The first epistle also speaks of the writer's earnest longings to see them again. He had made more than one attempt to visit them, but had been hindered. In such circumstances he sent Timothy to rectify rising disorders and errors among them. Surely it was unnecessary to send him so soon. Besides, the first letter expands and intensifies various things alluded to in the second; as the words, 'I charge you, by the Lord, that this epistle be read,' &c. (1 Thess. v. 27), are a stronger statement of 'if any man obey not our word by this epistle, note that man,' &c. (2 Thess. iii. 14). Nothing that has been said against this view is of much weight, such as, the allusions to the conversion of the Thessalonians in the first epistle, marking it to be the earliest of the two; and the improbability that a previous letter could have interposed itself between the visit of the apostle and chapters ii. and iii. of the first epistle. Why could not references to the conversion of the Thessalonians have been introduced into a second epistle with propriety, by the affectionate heart of the writer recurring to his first visit? We do not allow of any

references in the so-called second letter to the first. The allusion in 2 ii. 2 is to a supposititious epistle, not to a misconstruction of one which he had himself written; and *the epistle* mentioned in ii. 15 is that in which the allusion itself occurs. The 'gathering together unto Christ' spoken of in 2 ii. 1 is explained by 1 Thess. iv. 17, but does not imply the existence of the latter. The reverse is the fact, 1 Thess. iv. 15–17 being an explanation of *the gathering together* in 2 Thess. ii. 1. Professor Jowett himself admits that the second epistle anticipates the first in one sense, since it is based on the lesson which the apostle had taught the Thessalonians while he was with them.

Our opinion of the order in which the epistles were written is sanctioned by Grotius, Ewald, Baur, and Bunsen.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1864; Jowett, 1859; Lünemann; Koch, 1849, on the first only; and Ewald, 1857.

FIRST EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT CORINTH.

CORINTH was situated on an isthmus between the Aegean and Ionian seas. It was the capital of Achaia, noted for the Isthmian games celebrated in its neighbourhood, and for its arts, wealth, and luxury. Cicero styles it *the light of Greece.* About the year 146 B.C., it was destroyed by Mummius the Roman general. But Julius Caesar had it rebuilt, and peopled with colonists. Its favourable situation soon secured a flourishing commerce. The city rapidly regained its former splendour, in connection with former licentiousness. The gross worship of Venus, who had a renowned temple in the place, furnished with a thousand impure priestesses, furnishes melancholy evidence of debasement; notwithstanding the schools of philosophy on which, to use the words of Aristides the rhetorician, one stumbled at every step. Hence Dion Chrysostom terms it a city, 'the most licentious of all that are or have been.'[1]

This city, the meeting-place of eastern and western commerce, was selected by Paul, as the scene of his labours for a considerable period. The number and character of the inhabitants, added to the importance of the situation and the influx of strangers, made it desirable that Christianity should obtain a firm hold there. No station was more favourable to the diffusion of the new religion through the Roman empire. The apostle chose it as his sphere for eighteen months. Here he

[1] Orat. Corinth.—*Orationes*, vol. ii. p. 119, ed. Reiske.

worked, in company with several associates, amid the opulence, luxury, vice, and learning of the idolatrous inhabitants. As usual, he encountered opposition from the Jews who had settled in it for the purposes of traffic. Yet even among them some leading persons believed, as Crispus and Sosthenes; though the church consisted of Gentiles, chiefly belonging to the poorer class. Not many of them were wise, noble, or mighty.

The apostle visited the city on his second missionary journey, when he had left Athens. Here he found Aquila and his wife, who had lately arrived from Italy, in consequence of Claudius's decree against the Jews in Rome. Taking up his abode in the house of Aquila, he wrought at the same manual employment. Whether Aquila was a convert to Christianity before he came to Corinth, is not certain; the expression, 'a certain Jew' (Acts xviii. 2), being indefinite, and marking perhaps the nation to which he belonged. If he were a believer in Christianity, his knowledge could have been but imperfect, needing the enlargement and correction which the apostle would supply.

It is related in the Acts, according to the manner of the book, that Paul addressed himself first to the Jews at Corinth, preaching Christ in their synagogue on the Sabbath day. After Timothy and Silas arrived from Macedonia, he became bolder, and testified more plainly that Jesus was the Messiah. This gave great offence to the unbelievers, who contradicted and blasphemed. He therefore turned to the Gentiles, and succeeded so well in leading them from error, that the Jews seized and dragged him before Gallio the Roman proconsul, accusing him of opposition to the law of Moses. But the humane governor refused to interfere in ecclesiastical matters. After this insurrection, the historian states, that the apostle remained a good many days; then sailed to Syria with Aquila and Priscilla, leaving perhaps his faithful assistants, Timothy and Silas, in Corinth.

OCCASION OF THE EPISTLE.

Soon after Paul's arrival at Ephesus a second time, from Galatia, he must have heard of various irregularities which appeared in the conduct of the converts at Corinth, and wrote an epistle now lost, warning them against corrupt practices.

During his abode in Ephesus, he had opportunities of hearing particulars about the state of the church he had left; and the reports were unfavourable. Some members of Chloe's household, perhaps Apollos too who seems to have removed from Corinth to Ephesus while the apostle abode in the latter place, gave him information respecting the distractions of the community. These representations led to the resolution of taking a journey through Macedonia and *Achaia* to Jerusalem, preparatory to which he had sent Timothy and Erastus into those parts, to forward the collection for the relief of the poor Christians at Jerusalem, and to rectify the irregularities of the Corinthian church. Meanwhile messengers arrived, Stephanas, Fortunatus, and Achaicus, bringing a letter concerning various things, and asking different questions. By this means, he became acquainted with the contentions and disorders of the church; and was induced to write our first epistle, which was dictated perhaps to Sosthenes, and sent by the three messengers of the church. It was Paul's wish that Apollos should accompany the bearers, and use his endeavour to heal the distractions which had arisen; but he refused to go. Timothy had been despatched before the epistle was written. Had he been with the apostle, he would probably have been specified in the salutation at the commencement.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The letter was written, as we have seen, from Ephesus, when Paul was there the second time, towards

the close of his visit, and not long before Pentecost (1 Cor. xvi. 8), i.e. A.D. 57. The subscription states, that it was written from Philippi, the origin of which may be traced to an erroneous explanation of the words in xvi. 5, 'for I do pass through Macedonia,' which express no more than his present determination to pass through it. MS. B., but a reviser not the first hand, has the correct statement *Ephesus* in the subscription.

Many have discovered an allusion to the time of year in which the epistle was written, in the words, 'know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover was sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth' (v. 6–8). The metaphorical expressions in this passage are supposed to have been suggested by the near approach of the passover, when leaven was prohibited among the Jews. The apostle commences with a proverbial expression, meaning that as the smallest taint of sin had a tendency to spread through the mass, the Corinthian Christians should put away the old leaven of sin, that they might be holy; for Christ the true passover lamb had been offered for them. It is probable that the passage *was* suggested by the near approach of the Jewish passover, though it may be explained without the allusion. This fixes the time of writing in the spring of 57.

STATE OF THE CHURCH WHEN PAUL WROTE.

A community of believers gathered from among the inhabitants of Corinth must have presented phenomena demanding special attention. Surrounded by prevailing immorality, it was difficult for them to realise the purity which Christianity requires. The piety of the

believers was less steady and consistent than it would probably have been, had their state before conversion been different. Their depraved nature continued to exert considerable power over their conduct; and they were in great danger of relapsing into former practices. Christianity does not deliver the spirit at once from sinful excesses. It lays the axe to the root of the tree; but repeated strokes are necessary to kill the luxuriant growth. Regeneration is not like a sudden or magic spell. It is rather a process than an art; grace operating in accordance with the laws of our moral nature. The divine life is progressive and varied. We need not wonder, therefore, that the church at Corinth exhibited various disorders after Paul's departure. Some, unable to resist temptations, relapsed into old excesses; one had taken his step-mother to wife; and the majority exhibited a spirit of dissension arising out of individual preferences. Spiritual gifts were abused. The members were puffed up one against another. In the midst of these disagreeable things, the church wrote to their founder, informing him of their state, and asking his opinion on several points. He had heard from other quarters of their improprieties; and we may imagine his deep solicitude.

The greater part of the converts were Gentile Christians, as might have been expected, and as the notices in the Acts respecting the ministry of Paul attest. The contents of the letters themselves show a predominant heathen element. But there were not wanting members that had come out of Judaism, or had imbibed Jewish ideas and prejudices, so that the apostle had to give admonitions to Jewish and Gentile Christians in their mutual relations, as he does to other churches. The Cephas party mentioned in i. 12, proves that Jewish Christians were present in the Church. It is true that the Judaising opponents of the apostle present a different aspect from the usual one. Their antagonism to

Pauline Christianity does not proceed from the purely Jewish stand-point of circumcision. It has advanced to a more Christian stage, through tact or real religious development; through the felt necessity of accommodation to the circumstances of a Greek people in whom a less Jewish type of opposition would disarm prejudice and find readier access; or through its reaching a better form than the first. The central point of its attack was apostolic authority; one as dangerous to the apostle as any. Such was the smoother aspect of Jewish opposition; and it was more likely to find favour in a Greek-Christian Church, than the coarser and narrower type that resolved itself into circumcision.

1. With respect to parties in the church, it is impossible to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion. It is clear that there were classes who assumed the names of different leaders; but it is exceedingly difficult to ascertain their characteristic features, since the epistles themselves indicate little more than their existence. There is therefore a strong temptation to construct hypotheses respecting them out of imaginary or slender materials. We long to know more about them than what is written; and to draw upon our ingenuity. Yet probable conjecture must be summoned to aid the enquiry. Hints in the epistles, historical circumstances, scattered statements, must be combined, to yield some light on the subject.

The only passage in which the parties are clearly mentioned is 1 Cor. i. 12: 'Now this I say, that every one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I of Apollos; and I of Cephas; and I of Christ.' Other places supposed to indicate them are less definite.

The first question that occurs is, How many parties are specified here? To which some answer three, since the Christ party consisted of neutrals, who ranged themselves under no human head, but took Christ alone for their master; simple-minded Christians, who remained

steadfastly attached to Christ's teaching. Although this view is as old as Chrysostom, and claims support from 1 Cor. iii. 22, 23, where it is thought that the four parties are alluded to and that of Christ alone commended, it is really baseless. The words 'and ye are Christ's' allude to all the members; and the additional clause 'Christ is God's' seems designedly to exclude any commendation of the Christ party. The phrase *Christ himself is subject to God* cuts off the very basis of their pretensions; not that the basis was wrong in idea, but because it was applied in a schismatical spirit. The context of i. 12 is adverse to the hypothesis, for the thirteenth verse speaks of the first three with disapproval, and since the Christ party is classed along with them, it is involved in the general censure. The form of the expression 'Is Christ divided,' probably derived from 'and I of Christ,' leads to the inference that they as well as the rest were exposed to the charge of rending Christ.

Others answer that there were but two parties, properly speaking, in the church, the Pauline and the Petrine. As the Pauline and Apollos-christians were substantially one, because both must have been Gentiles holding the same doctrines which Paul and Apollos preached; it is thought that the Petrine and Christ party were substantially the same. Both were Jewish Christians, though they adopted different names. This hypothesis may be called that of Baur, for though taken from Schmidt, it received a new freshness from his ingenious illustration. The Christ party, as he supposes, were Jewish Christians, whose object was to undermine Paul's apostolic authority, and to engraft Judaism on Christianity. They called themselves after Cephas, the chief of the apostles. And to show that they were intimately connected with Christ through their teachers, they assumed the appellation 'of Christ,' indicating that they followed Christ's genuine apostles. They there-

fore cast indirect reproach on Paul, as if he were not a true apostle; and distinguished themselves from other members of the church, as if they alone were true Christians. The state of affairs in the community they belonged to caused the Judaisers to keep their legal notions in the background, and to insist on that aspect of them which detracted from Paul's authority.[1]

Various allusions in the epistle countenance the view in question. Thus the apostle writes in 2 Cor. x. 7: 'If any man trust to himself that he is Christ's, let him of himself think this again, that as he is Christ's, even so are we Christ's.' Here Paul is defending his apostleship against opponents or Judaisers, who seem to have claimed a relation to Christ which he had not—an idea directly denied. Probably also there is an allusion to the party in 1 Cor. ix. 1: 'Have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord?' in opposition to those who denied his apostleship, on the ground that he had not seen Christ. The context countenances the reference in question. It is also possible that 2 Cor. v. 16, 17 may involve a reference to the same persons, for after saying that he knows Christ no more after the flesh, the apostle adds: 'therefore if any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: old things are passed away, behold all things are become new.' Though the exact meaning of the phrase *to know Christ after the flesh* is difficult, we believe that some Jewish ideas may be included in it.

The objections advanced against this hypothesis by Neander and others can neither be refuted nor made good, because the epistles contain little knowledge on the subject. The objection that *Christ* was the assumed head, not a *human* leader which the other three parties claimed, is nugatory. It has been asked, What was the use of the two appellations? Was not one sufficient? We are inclined to believe, that the Petrine and

[1] Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi, pp. 261-332.

Christ party were subdivisions of one and the same class, not materially differing from one another. The Christ party were the more violent, pushing their hostility to Paul's apostleship to excess. Billroth is right so far, in thinking the Petrines the better disposed of the two.

It is needless to discuss the view of Olshausen and Guericke, once Neander's too, that the Christ party consisted of philosophical Christians, who constructed for themselves a peculiar form of Christian doctrine, modelled according to their Greek ideas, and belonged to the class of wisdom-seeking Greeks. Having a written gospel of their own, they rejected all apostolic traditions. In short, they were Gnostics, who saw no more than a higher Socrates in the Redeemer. The depreciation of human wisdom in the epistle is directed against them. The number of philosophic Christians in the church must have been very small. There is no ground for assuming that the gospel had attracted the cultivated heathen at Corinth. As preached by the apostle there, it must have repelled the persons who boasted of their wisdom. Nor is it necessary to enter into Schenkel's view, which makes the distinguishing peculiarity of the party *theosophic mysticism.* They appealed, it is thought, to an inward revelation, as Paul appealed to immediate revelations of Christ, and so, placing themselves on the same level, assailed his apostolic authority.[1] Rejecting apostolic tradition, and entering into communication with Christ by visions, they ascribed inspiration to themselves. The passages 1 Cor. ix. 1; 2 Cor. x. 7; xii. 1, &c., are supposed to find their explanation in this theosophic view. Though the hypothesis is adopted by De Wette, it is improbable, as Neander and Baur have shown. Rückert; Meyer, and Hofmann consider the party to have been orthodox, a hypothesis afterwards

[1] De ecclesia Corinthi primaeva factionibus turbata. Basiliae, 1838.

adopted by Neander. The enlargement of the parties from two to three gave rise to an earnest desire for union; and therefore a fourth tendency originated, which assumed independence of all human authority, and set itself above the rest. The name of Christ was used to cover and commend it. Though this view has much plausibility, and agrees well with the supposition that the four parties are mentioned in the order of their origination (1 Cor. i. 12), it is liable to objection. Indeed, it is easy to state difficulties in the way of any hypothesis that may be advanced. In the absence of definite information, speculation must be indulged to some extent; and all speculation can be met with contradiction by matter-of-fact expositors.

Referring the reader to Baur's masterly survey of the leading hypotheses respecting the Christ party we remark, that the sections may not have been very definite, or distinctly marked. Perhaps they were not well-defined, with boundary lines of doctrine dividing them the one from the other. That they were distinguished in some way from each other, even in a doctrinal view, must be allowed; but theological peculiarities were only one element in their discords. We cannot tell how far personal attachments and antipathies may have influenced them; or how much human prejudices had to do with their divisions.

The first idea occurring to the reader, is that the Christ party consisted of Jewish Christians. Those of Paul and Apollos were substantially one, and the last two should also be regarded as one in sentiment. By this means symmetry is introduced into the enumeration. The four are adduced in a logical method. But Rückert affirms, that a logical division of the members was not in the apostle's mind.[1] How does he know? Both epistles show that opponents in the church questioned

[1] Der erste Brief Pauli an die Korinther u. s. w., I. Beilage, p. 436.

Paul's apostleship, and therefore he vindicates his claims. The Jewish Christians, or Petrines, naturally did so; and 2 Cor. x. 7 leads to the conclusion that the Christ party did the same. They contented themselves with the name of Cephas at first, but soon assumed the title of Christ as a higher and better one; or rather, the more thorough-going, leaving the Petrine moderates behind, assumed a more catching appellation. The more the subject is studied, the more incorrect will the view of Schenkel appear. Nothing tangible favours the belief that they were theosophic Christians or spiritualising Gnostics; that they exalted human wisdom and laid claim to a deeper knowledge, which specially united them to Christ; that they inclined to merge the historical in the ideal Christ; or resolved Christianity into a spiritual essence. Such speculative or theosophic subjectivity seems to have found no lodgment among the members of the Corinthian church, who must have belonged to the humbler and poorer class. Hellenic philosophy presented no point of contact at the time with Christianity; and a theosophising subjectivity which attached itself to Christ alone, irrespectively of a mere human head, is unknown to the first century, when parties always chose an apostolic head.

It is natural to suppose that such Corinthians as had been converted by Paul were most attached to *his* person, believing in his apostolic authority and teachings. On the other hand, such as had been moved by Apollos, looked up to him with reverence. But Paul and Apollos preached the same truth, and their respective adherents did not differ in doctrinal opinions. Apollos was the more eloquent, Paul the more learned, at least in Jewish literature. The former was an Alexandrian Jew, tinged with the mode of interpretation applied to the Scriptures by the cultivated Jews of Egypt. This would naturally influence the manner in which he expounded Christianity, and suit the taste of Co-

rinthians accustomed to Greek culture. He had also the advantage of succeeding the apostle; and people usually like the last speaker, forgetting the past in favour of the present. From the twelfth verse of the first chapter to the end of the fourth chapter, the apostle refers to the Pauline and Apollos-christians; *the wisdom of the world*, contrasted with *the wisdom of God*, pointing to the latter. The indirect polemics of the first four chapters, directed against the Apollos adherents, lead to the supposition that their head set forth the doctrines of Christianity in a theosophic, Alexandrian mould, or in a scientific form which challenged the attention of the cultivated. In his hands the new religion approached the wisdom propounded in schools of philosophy by the garb it was dressed in—the garb of an artificial rhetoric. In proportion to the stress which the Apollos party laid upon *science*, the contrast between them and the Paulines would appear greater; for the apostle had determined to know nothing among the Corinthians but Jesus Christ and Him crucified. His gospel was so simple that it seemed to indicate a deficiency of culture; whereas he had refrained on purpose from the attractive language of human wisdom. The Christ preached by Paul and Apollos was the same; but the elements of his religion assumed a different shape in their hands.

The Jewish Christians in the Corinthian church, who cannot have been numerous, seem to have been stirred up by Judaisers from a distance, who followed Paul with persevering hostility; and the words of 2 Cor. iii. 1 hint that they had come to Corinth furnished with letters of commendation from Peter and James. But they were 'false apostles, deceitful workers, transforming themselves into the *apostles of Christ*,' language which identifies them with the Christ party. They could not sympathise in the free views of the direct converts from heathenism, or release themselves

from the obligations of the law without difficulty. They naturally chose Peter for their head, though Peter himself had never been in Corinth. Their narrow creed kept them in a mental slavery inconsistent with the freedom of Paul's gospel. Enemies to the universalism of the apostle, they concentrated their opposition on his authority, without making the necessity of circumcision a rallying point. Their Judaising propensities, in this instance, took another direction. Under the banner of the apostle of the circumcision, their weapons were less carnal, but not the less effectual.

Some have doubted whether the parties in the church were distinguished from one another by doctrinal opinions, both because there is no necessary connection between the existence of schisms and diversities of sentiments, and because the apostle condemns the schisms without reference to doctrinal errors characterising them. But though the Corinthians disputed about the comparative excellence of their teachers, the Petrine differed from the Pauline Christians in doctrinal views. Why the apostle refrains from assigning the errors he condemns, to the respective parties, cannot be discovered. Perhaps those errors could not be definitely distributed, but floated more or less among all—a circumstance which suggests caution to the interpreter, lest he attempt to do what the writer himself has avoided. But we may arrive at probable conclusions respecting the inclination of the several parties to erroneous sentiments or practices noticed in the epistle. The spirit of the church was a sensuous or carnal one. Its standard of purity was low; its members of a heterogeneous sort. Those who divide all professing Christians into regenerate and unregenerate, or who hold that a proper church should consist of the former alone, are discountenanced by the uncertain character of the Corinthian believers, many of whom were as far from modern orthodoxy as from

sanctity of life. The church was disorderly and unspiritual, its elements consisting of voluptuous Greeks of the lower class, with a minority of cultivated minds, to which the new religion offered few attractions. When Christianity came first into contact with the Greek mind, it had to make its way slowly through modes of thought alien to its genius, which were seconded, only too strongly, by a loose morality. Idealism and sensuousness presented an uncongenial front to the doctrine that true life comes only through faith in a crucified Messiah, in union with whom the believer lives unto righteousness.

In addition to the contentions of parties, other disorders existed.

2. Some had fallen into sins of uncleanness. That lewdness had become pretty general may be inferred from the words, 'It is reported commonly, that there is fornication among you' (v. 1), where the adverb 'commonly'[1] refers to the whole clause, intimating that varieties of uncleanness, included in the generic term 'fornication,' existed among the Corinthians. The writer then proceeds to notice an extreme case of impurity, viz., unnatural intercourse between a step-son and step-mother. Whether the case was one of marriage or concubinage is unimportant. The verb 'to have'[2] is commonly applied to the former, and that idea agrees best with v. 2, 3. Notwithstanding the scandalous nature of the act, the members of the church had not withdrawn from the society of the incestuous. The man may have pleaded the privilege of proselytes to Judaism—that conversion abolished degrees of relationship. The woman was probably a heathen. The apostle enjoins immediate exclusion from the church, and takes occasion to speak of other vices—covetousness, idolatry, railing, drunkenness, extortion, which

[1] ὅλως. [2] ἔχειν.

should be dealt with in the same manner. He exhorts his readers to have no intercourse with fornicators or persons guilty of notorious vices, but to disavow their deeds, lest Christians should countenance sin in the eyes of the heathen.

3. In their observance of the Lord's Supper, various abuses had crept into the practices of the Corinthian Christians. This feast consisted of two parts—a preparatory meal or *love feast* preceding *the supper*, properly so called. To this *agape* (love feast) each brought meat and drink, of which all partook on an equal footing. The poor man shared the bounty of the rich, as if he had contributed his part of the meal; and the brethren, rich and poor, masters and slaves, exhibited a spectacle of unity to the world. But when Christian love cooled, the agapae lost their true character. Those who brought food with them ate and drank by themselves, apart from the members whom poverty prevented from contributing. The poor, in their hunger, were therefore compelled to look on; while the rich brethren, having more than was necessary, indulged in excess. One was hungry, and another was drunken. The meal degenerated into a private feast, losing its proper significance. By such conduct the rich unfitted themselves for joining in the essential part of the transaction with spiritual discernment or reverence. The apostle condemns these. From whatever source the Gentile Christians borrowed their love feasts, similar meals do not seem to have prevailed in the apostolic churches generally. The apostle did not forbid them, as some suppose, but wrote against their abuse. They are condemned as far as they ceased to promote Christian love, that is, as far as their original purpose was lost sight of.

4. Another impropriety committed by the Corinthian Christians consisted in appeals to heathen tribunals, showing that a generous confidence in the fidelity of

their brethren had given place to selfishness. It was customary for the Jews to decide disputes before tribunals of their own, a practice supposed to be based on Exodus xxi. 1,[1] and transferred perhaps from the synagogue to the Christian church. To correct these unseemly disputes before civil magistrates, the apostle reasons with the Corinthians thus: 'If the saints are to judge the world and angels themselves, they are much more competent to decide the minor affairs of the present state.' Legal disputes before heathens are censured, as contrary to Christian love.

5. Some of the believers doubted or denied the truth of the resurrection. These doubts sprang up in Pagan soil. Gentile Christians belonging to the church entertained them, men who denied an existence after death; basing their objections on the Christian doctrine of the resurrection, which was exceedingly opposed to Greek and Roman ideas. Whether such scepticism arose from a philosophic tendency, or was fostered by the prevailing sensuousness at Corinth, cannot be ascertained. In opposing it the apostle does not distinguish between resurrection and immortality, because in his view the conception of continued life involved that of the body's existence. The number of persons who had these doubts seems to have been small; and if they belonged to any party, it was to that of Apollos. In refuting their notions, Paul begins with the cardinal fact of Christ's resurrection, and having proved its reality, adopts it as the basis of his reasoning, grounding the fact of the general resurrection upon it. He then adverts to the *how* of the question, lessening the difficulty by stating that the resurrection body will be a *spiritual*, not a *natural*, organism.

The apostle *heard* of these improprieties. We shall

[1] 'These are the judgments which thou shalt set before them' (the Jews, not the Gentiles).

now advert to other topics, about which he had been asked by letter.

6. The subject of marriage was one that perplexed part of the Christian church at Corinth. It is not easy, however, to discover the precise point to which their question referred, because the writer touches on several things in his answer. He speaks first of marriage generally, recommending that state to all as one preventive of fornication. At the same time, he prefers a single life for those who could purely bear it. He condemns separations and divorces, even though one of the parties be a heathen, as long as the unbeliever chooses to continue with the other. After a short digression, he turns to the unmarried, recommending them to remain single because of impending calamities; and touches at the end on the marriage of widows.

As far as we can judge, the particular point of enquiry was this: Is celibacy preferable to a wedded life?

It is difficult to discover the party among whom a preference for celibacy had appeared. It is unlikely that it prevailed among the Jewish Christians, or the Christ party. The Pauline Christians may have overvalued celibacy, because Paul was unmarried. But even this is doubtful, because the adherents of Paul, in after times, never insisted on a single life. An ascetic spirit had appeared among the Corinthians, leading some to argue for celibacy as a state of peculiar virtue. This disposition, which showed itself early in the primitive churches, was not confined to the Paulines. It arises out of temperament rather than opinion.

While treating of the marriage relation, the apostle lays down a general maxim deserving particular notice. In whatever situation Christianity finds an individual, it does not interfere with his external relations, nor command him to start away abruptly from former pursuits. The existing order of society was undisturbed outwardly by the new religion. This is applied to the case

of slaves. Primitive Christianity did not enjoin masters to set their slaves at liberty. It prepared them to be kind and benevolent towards that class. Slaves themselves were exhorted to submit patiently to the yoke. But Paul did not undervalue civil liberty. He advised every slave to avail himself of a legitimate opportunity to obtain his emancipation. 'If thou mayest be made free, use it rather.' From this application of a general principle to the state of slaves, we infer that he looked upon the institution as uncongenial with the spirit of Christianity.

7. Another question related to the duties of Christians respecting flesh previously offered to idols. Some Gentile converts not only ate without scruple meat sold in the market, after it had been dedicated to idols, but partook of the feasts held in heathen temples, at which such flesh was set before the guests. This conduct gave offence to Jewish Christians, whose weak consciences naturally revolted at idolatry.

In replying to the enquiry addressed to the apostle on this subject, he notices three points, as if three questions had been asked. Should a Christian eat the flesh of an animal offered in sacrifice to idols, after that flesh has been exposed for sale and purchased as food? Should a Christian accept the invitation of a friend to partake of a feast held in a heathen temple? Should a Christian go to a private entertainment and eat the flesh of animals dedicated to idols? He replies to the first in the affirmative, mentioning, however, a limit to the exercise of Christian freedom. Care must be taken not to offend a weak brother, since an action harmless in itself ceases to be indifferent when it hurts the feelings or prejudices of a tender conscience. He answers the second in the negative, because every Christian present at idol-feasts makes himself a partaker of the idolatrous worship. As to the third, he allows a Christian to eat everything set before him at a private entertainment without scruple.

But if any guest should say of a particular dish, 'this meat has been offered in sacrifice to an idol,' the believer is exhorted to abstain, out of regard to the conscience of others.

This topic relates to the Pauline and Petrine parties. The weak were the Jewish Christians, who had scruples of conscience about countenancing idolatry, and allowed their minds to be harassed with anxiety when there was no real ground for it. The Pauline Christians, on the other hand, entertaining correct notions of freedom, joined without scruple in festive entertainments where flesh left after sacrifices was used, and paid little regard to the uneasiness of the Petrine Christians. Very wisely does the apostle deal with the question by enforcing the law of love to modify things in themselves indifferent. That law binds the believer to act in accordance with the spiritual benefit of others.

It would be unnecessary to mention Meyer's opinion that *the weak* are *Gentile* Christians, were it not that it derives support from a critical reading which he adopts after Lachmann and Tischendorf, in viii. 7, '*with conscience until now* of the idol, eat it as a thing offered to an idol,' &c.,[1] meaning that their conscience was transferred from their heathen state to their Christian one, in supposing that an idol was a real thing.[2] The reading, though attested by external evidence, is hardly placed beyond doubt; and even if it were, it seems far-fetched to restrict the phrase *till now*, to the noun alone that precedes it. It belongs to the whole clause.

8. Another subject referred to the apostle, was the demeanour of females in public meetings. Misapplying Christian liberty, females appeared unveiled in congregations of worshippers composed of both sexes; a practice adopted in imitation of the men, who, according to Greek

[1] *τῇ συνειδήσει ἕως ἄρτι τοῦ εἰδώλου, κ.τ.λ.*

[2] Exeget. Handbuch über den ersten Brief an die Korinther, p. 175, 2nd ed.

custom, appeared with uncovered heads. This was an improper application of their privileges, as if they stood on a perfect equality with the male sex. They even prayed and prophesied in the public assemblies unveiled, assuming the office of teachers. The apostle condemns the custom of removing the veil in promiscuous meetings of worshippers, as well as that of praying and prophesying in public; though he reserves his denunciation of the latter to a subsequent occasion (xii. 34). He reminds woman of her subordination to man; showing their true relation to one another and to Christ; and indicates that the *tendency* of the custom of appearing in public meetings with uncovered heads is immoral.

9. The Corinthian church enjoyed a large measure of spiritual gifts. These were not equivalent to what are now called *miraculous*, but consisted in the exaltation of the natural faculties, the elevation and purification of talents belonging to humanity. The excitement produced upon susceptible spirits by a new religion in the apostolic age was often powerful and extraordinary. A divine impulse stretched the mind to an unwonted pitch, and gave it a beneficial direction. But unworthy motives interfered with the exercise of spiritualised mental endowments; and their exhibition was unedifying. In an ecstatic state, the Corinthians used words inarticulate, disconnected, confused, which conveyed little meaning to the hearer, because the speakers themselves were not conscious of a meaning. The charism did not consist in the ability to speak foreign languages, as has been often supposed, but in impassioned exclamations, and in obscure, incoherent outbursts of prayer. As it was dazzling and striking, the gift was overrated by its possessors and used for ostentation, because it excited wonder in the hearers.

The apostle enters into a minute consideration of the subject of charisms, pointing out their right use. Prophesying is preferred to speaking in tongues, because it

tended to edification. Love, however, is put above all gifts, because it regulates their exercise.

10. The only other question of the Corinthian church related to a collection for the poor saints at Jerusalem, about which the apostle gives some directions.

PAUL'S VISITS TO THE CORINTHIANS BEFORE HE WROTE TO THEM.

It has been debated whether Paul visited Corinth once or twice before he wrote to the believers there. The Acts notice only one visit. But that is no argument against another. The supposition of a second is derived from passages in the epistles themselves, from 2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2; xii. 14; ii. 1; xii. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 7. As the two visits must have preceded the first epistle, because the second could not have happened between the first and second epistles, passages from both epistles are relevant.

'This is the third time I am coming to you. In the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word be established. I told you before, and foretell you, as if I were present, the second time; and being absent, now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that I come again, and will not spare' (2 Cor. xiii. 1, 2). These words plainly express the idea that the writer purposed to pay the readers a third visit.

'Behold, the third time I am ready to come to you; for I seek yours, not you,' &c. (2 Cor. xii. 14). The meaning is the same as before. The apostle was ready to visit them the third time. The preceding context —'for what is it wherein ye were inferior to other churches, except it be that I myself was not burdensome to you? Forgive me this wrong'—contains keen irony, and agrees best with the supposition that the writer had been at Corinth twice. The greater the

number of his visits during which he had received no maintenance from the people, the severer his irony.

2 Cor. ii. 1 is less explicit. 'I determined this with myself, that I would not come again to you in heaviness.' The apostle had not gone to them in sorrow, as we learn from Acts xviii. 1; neither can it be said that he was humbled on the occasion of his first visit (xii. 21). A subsequent and sorrowful visit is therefore implied. 'For I will not see you now by the way; but I trust to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit' (1 Cor. xvi. 7). These words intimate that his next visit would be of some length, compared with the passing one he had last paid. The first was nearly two years, and therefore he must have been again with them for a short time.

But 2 Cor. i. 15, 16, presents an apparent objection to this view. 'And in this confidence I was minded to come unto you before, that ye might have a second benefit; and to pass by you into Macedonia, and to come again out of Macedonia unto you, and of you to be brought on my way towards Judea.' If two visits to Corinth are presupposed elsewhere, why should he speak of *one* benefit conferred by his personal presence? Why not intimate *two benefits*, and so mention a *third*, 'that ye might have a third benefit'? This reasoning is plausible but not conclusive. To meet it, we need not assume, with Bleek,[1] after Chrysostom, that *a second benefit* is equivalent to *a second joy*. The apostle speaks of an intended journey, before the sending of his first epistle, which he had testified in the lost letter; and the second benefit refers to his second presence with them, after returning from Macedonia, as is expressed in the sixteenth verse. It leaves out of account the apostle's first abode at Corinth, and alludes solely to his purpose of seeing the Corinthians, on his return

[1] In the Studien und Kritiken for 1830, p. 614, *et seq.*

from Macedonia, as well as on his way to it. This is better than to suppose that, during the apostle's residence at Corinth of eighteen months, he had gone into the neighbouring districts, and returned to Corinth, so that in one sense he had been there twice, in another only once; in which case he could speak of another visit, either as the third or second. It is remarkable that Schott and Anger should defend a hypothesis so improbable.

There are other difficulties against the assumption of an unnoticed visit to Corinth. If the state of the church was such as to give uneasiness to the apostle at the time of his visit, as is inferred from 2 Cor. xii. 21; ii. 1, it is not easy to understand how his first epistle could omit all mention of that visit, and of his efforts against the disorders he had then witnessed. If the church were not thus distracted, the interpretation of the passages referred to falls away; and it is incomprehensible how the community could have speedily become so bad, since the visit must have preceded the first epistle by a very short interval. Ingenious as these suggestions of De Wette's are,[1] the testimony of plain words, in their natural acceptation, must not be abandoned on their account.

In view of all that has been ingeniously said in favour of the second visit by Bleek, we cannot but assent to it. There are difficulties on the other side which the critic cannot overlook; but greater ones attend its rejection.

At what place of the Acts it should be inserted, can only be conjectured. It is best to put it during the apostle's abode at Ephesus of nearly three years' length (Acts xix.), as Schrader and others do. To put it elsewhere, in the year and a half's sojourn at Corinth, with Schott and Anger; or in the interval between his first and second visit to Ephesus, as Neander conjectures, is less probable.

[1] Einleitung, § 132a, 6th ed.

THE FIRST EXTANT EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS, NOT THE FIRST WHICH THEY RECEIVED FROM THE APOSTLE.

We have assumed that the present first epistle was preceded by a lost one, on the basis of v. 9, 'I wrote unto you *in the epistle*,' &c. These words are rendered either, 'I have written to you in this epistle,' or, 'I wrote to you in that epistle.' In the former case, they refer to the letter he was writing; in the latter, to one he had written. We demur to the view that the aorist of the verb [1] may be translated 'I have written,' as if it were equivalent to the perfect. The only correct version of it is, 'I wrote.' Bishop Middleton [2] refers to various places where the article is employed as here, 'the *present* epistle;' but none is pertinent, because the expression in question occurs at the end of the writing. The letters in which the phrase appears are virtually finished. This is different from the present case, where the same expression, so far from referring to a letter all but finished, is supposed to allude to preceding verses. *The epistle* can only mean the present epistle when it is written, not when it is towards the beginning. That the same phrase may mean *a former epistle*, is shown by 2 Cor. vii. 8, where it refers to our extant first epistle.

It is impossible to find the part to which the writer alludes, if *the letter* means that which he was then writing. The reference is neither anticipative, as Lardner and others suppose, nor to the verses immediately preceding. No part of the context contains an injunction not to company with fornicators, for the whole exhibits no more than a general exhortation to purity, and an expectation, on the writer's part, that his readers should not delay to excommunicate the notorious offender. Supposing that the reference is to the second verse of the chapter, or to the fifth, sixth, and seventh, what is the use of the

[1] ἔγραψα.

[2] The Doctrine of the Greek Article. Rose's ed. p. 324.

phrase *in the epistle?* The general sense does not require it.

The opinion that a lost epistle is referred to, which the words themselves justify, gave rise to two apocryphal ones; one purporting to proceed from the Corinthians, the other from St. Paul. They were first published in Armenian, with a Latin translation by Wilkins;[1] and in the same year by Philipp Masson in Armenian and Latin;[2] Fabricius also gave them in Latin and Greek, in the third part of his 'Codex Apocryphus N. T.' They were inserted by Whiston in his collection of authentic records belonging to the Old and New Testament, in Latin, English, and Arabic, with a defence of their authenticity.[3] His two sons afterwards edited them in Armenian, Greek, and Latin, as an appendix to their edition of Moses Choronensis's history.[4] The best and most complete translation is that made by Father Aucher and Lord Byron, published in Moore's life of the latter.[5] The letters are manifest forgeries, not earlier than the eleventh century. It is strange that their authenticity should have found a second defender in Rinck, when Whiston's own sons hesitated to accept it.

AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the first epistle to the Corinthians has not been called in question except by Bruno Bauer. Early Christian writers always assigned the work to Paul. Clement of Rome, Ignatius, and Polycarp quote or allude to it, perhaps also Justin Martyr. The first writes: 'Take up the epistle of the blessed apostle Paul; what did he first write to you in the beginning

[1] Amsterdam, 1715, 4to.
[2] Histoire critique de la République des Lettres, vol. x. p. 150, *et seq.*
[3] Part ii. p. 585, &c., 1719.
[4] 1736, 4to. London, p. 371, &c.
[5] Vol. vi. pp. 274, 275.

of the gospel? Of a truth he wrote to you by the Spirit concerning himself, and Cephas and Apollos, because you had even then formed parties.'[1] Ignatius says: 'It is becoming, therefore, that in every way you should glorify Jesus Christ, who has glorified you; that in one obedience ye may be perfectly joined together in the same mind and in the same judgment, and may all speak the same thing of the same thing.'[2] And again: 'The cross, which is a stumbling-block to unbelievers, but to us salvation and eternal life. Where is the wise? Where is the disputer? Where is the boasting of them who are called prudent?'[3] Polycarp has the following: 'Do we not know that the saints shall judge the world, as Paul teaches?'[4] Again: 'Neither fornicators, nor effeminate, nor abusers of themselves with mankind, shall inherit the kingdom of God,' &c.[5] Justin Martyr writes: 'For Christ was the passover, who was afterwards sacrificed,' &c.[6] Irenaeus is the first author who expressly cites the epistle as Paul's: 'This also the apostle (Paul) manifestly shews in the epistle addressed to the Corinthians, saying: "Moreover, brethren, I would not that ye should be ignorant how that all our

[1] Ἀναλάβετε τὴν ἐπιστολὴν τοῦ μακαρίου Παύλου τοῦ ἀποστόλου. Τί πρῶτον ὑμῖν ἐν ἀρχῇ τοῦ εὐαγγελίου ἔγραψεν; ἐπ' ἀληθείας πνευματικῶς ἐπέστειλεν ὑμῖν, περὶ αὐτοῦ τε, καὶ Κηφᾶ τε, καὶ Ἀπόλλω, διὰ τὸ καὶ τότε προσκλίσεις ὑμᾶς πεποιῆσθαι.—*Ep. ad Cor.* c. 47. Comp. also 1 Cor. x. 24 with ch. 48.; xii. 12 with ch. 37; xiii. with ch. xlix.; xv. 20 with ch. xxiv.; ii. 9 with ch. xxxiv.

[2] Πρέπον οὖν ἐστιν κατὰ πάντα τρόπον δοξάζειν Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν δοξάσαντα ὑμᾶς, ἵνα ἐν μιᾷ ὑποταγῇ ἦτε κατηρτισμένοι τῷ αὐτῷ νοὶ καὶ τῇ αὐτῇ γνώμῃ, καὶ τὸ αὐτὸ λέγητε πάντες περὶ τοῦ αὐτοῦ, κ.τ.λ.—*Ad Ephes.* c. 2.

[3] Ὅ ἐστιν σκάνδαλον τοῖς ἀπιστοῦσιν, ἡμῖν δὲ σωτηρία, καὶ ζωὴ αἰώνιος. ποῦ σοφός; ποῦ συζητής; ποῦ καύχησις τῶν λεγομένων συνετῶν;—*Ad Ephes.* c. 8.

[4] An nescimus quia sancti mundum judicabunt, sicut Paulus docet? —*Ad Philipp.* c. 11.

[5] Καὶ οὔτε πόρνοι, οὔτε μαλακοί, οὔτε ἀρσενοκοῖται βασιλείαν Θεοῦ κληρονομήσουσιν, οὔτε οἱ ποιοῦντες τὰ ἄτοπα.—*Ad Philipp.* c. 5.

[6] Ἦν γὰρ τὸ πάσχα ὁ Χριστός, ὁ τυθεὶς ὕστερον.—*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 374, ed. Thirlby.

fathers were under the cloud,"' &c.[1] So too Athenagoras: 'It is therefore manifest that, according to the apostle, this corruptible must put on incorruption.'[2] Clement of Alexandria has: 'The blessed Paul in the first epistle to the Corinthians has solved the question, when he writes thus: "Brethren, be not children in understanding,"' &c.[3] Tertullian has the following passage: 'Paul, in the first epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of them who denied or doubted a resurrection.'[4] It was also in Marcion's canon.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into four parts, viz. i. 1–iv. 21; v. 1–xi. 1; xi. 2–xiv. 20; xv. xvi.

1. This division relates to the party divisions in the church, which the writer censures and endeavours to heal.

After the usual salutation the apostle congratulates his readers on their reception of the gospel, accompanied with abundant gifts and graces. He beseeches them to be united in love, instead of being divided into contending parties; thanks God that he had furnished no ground for undue attachment to his person, since he had baptized very few, his chief object being to preach. The believers are warned against worldly wisdom, as opposed to the gospel, where all true wisdom centres in the cross (i. 1–31).

[1] Et hoc autem Apostolum in epistola quae est ad Corinthios manifestissime ostendisse, dicentem: Nolo enim vos ignorare, fratres, quoniam patres nostri omnes sub nube fuerunt, &c.—*Adv. Haeres.* iv. 27, p. 1057, ed. Migne.

[2] Εὔδηλον παντὶ τὸ λειπόμενον, ὅτι δεῖ κατὰ τὸν ἀπόστολον, τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο καὶ διασκεδαστὸν ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν, ἵνα, κ.τ.λ.—*De Resurrect. Mort.* 18, p. 266, ed. Otto.

[3] Σαφέστατα γοῦν ὁ μακάριος Παῦλος ἀπήλλαξεν ἡμᾶς τῆς ζητήσεως ἐν τῇ προτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους ἐπιστολῇ, ὧδέ πως γράφων· Ἀδελφοί, μὴ παιδία γίνεσθε ταῖς φρεσίν, κ.τ.λ.—*Paedagog.* i. p. 118, ed. Potter.

[4] Paulus in prima ad Corinthios notat negatores et dubitatores resurrectionis.—*De praescript. Haereticorum*, c. 33.

He describes how he had preached the crucified One among them, not according to the forms of learning or philosophy, but in unadorned simplicity, lest his success should seem due to human eloquence. The fleshly man cannot discern excellency or wisdom in such a theme; to him it is foolishness: only he who has the Spirit of God and therefore spiritual discernment, receives and comprehends it as the highest wisdom (ii.).

The Corinthians had made so little progress in piety that the apostle could not address them as spiritual Christians. To this he attributes their aberrations and divisions; for instead of attaching themselves solely to Christ as their head, they had shown undue partiality to human instrumentality. But none other foundation can be laid than Christ himself, and every one must look to the nature of the materials which he builds up, lest the structure prove unable to stand the fiery test of the great day (iii.). For himself, he was perfectly convinced of his apostolic calling, and was comparatively indifferent to the opinions of men, from whom he had not sought the praise due to faithful stewards of the divine mysteries. The sufferings he had to endure were the true proof of his apostleship and disinterestedness. His self-denying labours are alluded to not for the purpose of upbraiding his readers, but to show the disinterestedness required in preachers of the gospel. Whatever instructors they had, *he* was their spiritual father, and beseeches them to follow none other gospel than what they had received from his lips (iv.).

2. The second part is more occupied with matters that concerned the private than the public relations of the Corinthian converts, but not exclusively so.

The apostle condemns his readers for associating with an incestuous person, whom he commands them to expel from the church, and to have no intercourse either with him or any immoral member (v.). He censures them for taking their disputes before heathen tribunals, in-

stead of settling them by mutual arbitration. So far from bearing injuries patiently, they had injured others. But such practices must preclude admission into the kingdom of heaven. Though they had been great sinners in their heathen state, Christianity demands purity; and a believer's body must be holy, because it is the temple of the Holy Spirit (vi.). In the seventh chapter he answers the question that had been addressed to him respecting marriage and celibacy, touching on various collateral topics, not included perhaps in the letter. The subject of Christian liberty is next treated, with special reference to the use of flesh once dedicated to idols. Here he adduces himself as an example to the Corinthians, whence they might perceive how he had abstained from lawful enjoyments, in order to recommend the gospel more effectually, by accommodation to the wants and even the prejudices, of others. He did not avail himself of his Christian liberty to the full extent; he had not married; he had taken from them no temporal support, but had laboured with his hands to supply his necessities (ix.). The melancholy affects of abusing freedom are shown in the history of the Israelites; and the Corinthians are warned lest they too should be overtaken in a false security (x. 1–xi. 1).

3. The third division treats of the public relations of Christians.

Here the apostle condemns irregularities existing among the Corinthians in the worship of God, such as the appearing of females in their assemblies, with uncovered heads, whereas a becoming distinction should be observed between males and females in this particular, as a token of the latter's modesty and subjection (xi. 2–16). Abuses connected with the Lord's supper are also censured, the apostle expounding the mode of its institution as he had received it by revelation, and the sin of unworthy partakers (17–34). He proceeds to consider the gift of tongues, and the relation it bears to similar

gifts generally, affirming that every one who speaks in the Spirit acknowledges Jesus to be the Lord—that such confession proves him to have received the Spirit, who is manifested in various ways. All charisms have one object, the edification of the church. None should be preferred above another, since all are necessary; just as the different members of the body have each an important function to perform (xii.). This unity of spiritual gifts, both in their origin and object, commends the great principle of love, which is above them all, and without which they are valueless. Here the writer graphically describes the nature of love, representing it, with faith and hope, as one of the three cardinal virtues, and preferring it even to them (xiii.). After this he speaks of the two gifts of tongues and prophesying, showing that the former should not be exercised indiscriminately, since it is useless unless accompanied with interpretation; while the other is intelligible by itself (xiv. 1–33). Women are enjoined to be silent in churches; and all things should be conducted with propriety and order in the public meetings of the saints (34–40).

4. The fourth part relates to the resurrection, which some in the church denied; and concludes with a few general directions.

The fifteenth chapter discusses the doctrine of the resurrection, and asserts its necessary connection with the leading truths of Christianity. The apostle affirms the inseparable union between Christ's resurrection and that of believers. He rests his argument for a general resurrection on Christ's rising from the dead, showing with what intensity of belief he held the latter. All faith he holds to be vain, unless Christ rose from the dead. His reasoning is of the passionate, ardent kind so conspicuous in the epistle to the Romans, in which the heart controls the head. Whatever be thought of its conclusiveness, it has its value to the Christian of

every age, teaching him that intensity of conviction, accompanied by supreme love to God and man, ennobles its subject. An illustration borrowed from the organism of plants, to prove that a resurrection of the body is consistent with reason and nature, so far from implying that the same body rises, indicates the reverse. And the three verses 39–41 imply that the same body will not appear again. The analogy of multiplied and varied organisations in nature shows diversity. The flesh of animals; heavenly and earthly bodies; the splendours of the sun, moon, and stars are different; why should the resurrection body not follow analogy? The distinction between the earthly and resurrection body is summed up in the phrases, *psychical body*, *pneumatic body*, which convey no definite ideas to us. In the one, the *psyche*, i.e. *animal life*, is the predominant agent, and the *pneuma* is subordinate; in the other, the *pneuma*, the divine, eternal principle rules, and the *psyche* has ceased to be a principle. We may call these *soul* and *spirit*; *soul* in the present body; *spirit* in the future one, but their respective natures are unknown.

It is also observable, that the death of Adam and of all mankind in him (xv. 21) are not spoken of as the consequence of his sin, but of an earthly nature. In the fifth chapter of the epistle to the Romans Adam's sin is stated to be the cause of his death. Are the representations of the apostle in 1 Cor. xv. and ep. to Romans v. consistent with one another? Fritzsche supposes they are not; Meyer has a laboured note to show their harmony. Can it be, that the writer was inexact in his illustrations; and that on abstruse points he had no definite knowledge? (xv.).

The last chapter recommends the contribution for the poor at Jerusalem, informs them of the writer's intended journey to Corinth, subjoins admonitions, and concludes with some salutations (xvi.).

The apostle, who had himself founded the Corinthian

church, specially loved it, and nurtured it with uncommon care. The relations between the spiritual father and his offspring were intimate and confidential. His experiences among these converts were diversified, his difficulties peculiar; and the human side of his individuality is seen in what he writes to them more clearly than in any other epistle. His practical sagacity, spiritual insight, tact, and delicacy were called into exercise by the weighty problem to be solved—the planting of a new religion in Greek soil. Experiences among the people prepared him for dealing with them wisely, and for applying Christian principles to the full reality of concrete life, with consummate skill.

The epistle is unlike those to the Romans and Galatians. Truth appears in that to the Galatians in its rougher elements, where strength takes the place of fineness; in that to the Romans it passes into the abstract domain of doctrinal propositions and contrasts; it is seen here in the manifestations of actual life. The theology is ethical not doctrinal, entering into relations public and private, healing disorders, correcting mistakes, and furnishing wholesome precepts. Nowhere is the many-sidedness of the apostle's mind so evident—the breadth and largeness of view that touch topics of multifarious difficulty with masterly ability. The Spirit of God had endowed him beyond ordinary humanity, not in vain as the letters to the Corinthians demonstrate. All his powers and spiritual discernment were needed for the successful solution of the problem, which the first church reared on the classic ground of ancient Greece presented; nor did they fail to meet it successfully.

SECOND EPISTLE TO THE CORINTHIANS.

ACCOUNT OF THE APOSTLE BETWEEN THE WRITING OF THE FIRST AND SECOND EXTANT EPISTLES.

We have assumed that Timothy did not go as far as Corinth, but returned from Macedonia to Ephesus without a report of the affairs at Corinth. There is no mention of his visiting Corinth in 2 Cor. xii. 18, although it might have been looked for there; nor is it alluded to in Acts xix. 22. It is said indeed in explanation, that as Timothy is associated with the apostle in writing the epistle, a notice of his mission in the third person would have been inappropriate; but Timothy is associated with Paul in the Philippian letter, which contains notices in the third person notwithstanding (ii. 19). Nor can it be urged that some remark and apology would have appeared in this epistle if the journey had been abandoned, as long as we are ignorant of the circumstances which induced Timothy to stop short of Corinth. No charge of fickleness could have been founded upon a journey carried out only in part; at least against the apostle, as long as he had sent Timothy. If the messenger was disheartened and feared to proceed to Corinth, or if he saw fit to return sooner than he had purposed, the sender could not be held responsible. All that Meyer suggests against the hypothesis of an unfinished visit to Corinth is invalid. When the apostle found that his young friend returned without the wished-for intelligence, he sent Titus (vii. 14, 15; xii. 17, 18), the object of whose mission is not stated. It may be supposed to have been connected with the

contribution for the poor at Jerusalem, though that can scarcely have been the cause. It is much more likely that the writer despatched his friend to observe and strengthen the effect which the first epistle was intended to make upon the church. He would be expected to bring back intelligence of the state of parties after the letter had been received, and of the general feeling towards the writer.

Did Titus bear a letter on this occasion? If so, it is lost. Bleek[1] assumes that he did, and some passages in the second extant epistle apparently countenance the idea: 'And I wrote this same unto you, lest when I came I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice; having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all,' &c., &c. (ii. 3, 4). Here Paul says that he wrote his reproof to the Corinthians respecting the incestuous person in a very painful state of mind, accompanied with many tears. The passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians, v. 1–8, is pronounced not strong enough to justify the inference of its being here alluded to, and therefore a lost letter must be assumed. The language is not sufficiently severe or painful; neither is the topic of the incestuous man a prominent one in the first epistle. That the allusion to 1 Cor. v. 1, &c., is felt to be unsuitable appears from the fact that some critics connect the apostle's words in ii. 3, 4 with the 4th, 5th, and 6th chapters of the first epistle; while Schrader connects them with the whole letter. Such reasoning is inconclusive. The first verse of the 5th chapter of 1 Cor. must have caused pain to the writer and sorrow to the readers—how much, can only be conceived. The apostle says in 2 Cor. ii. 3, 4, that he had written to the Corinthians a reproof about the incestuous person which had caused them grief, out of affection for them, that he might not have sorrow after his arrival.

[1] In the Studien und Kritiken, for 1830, iii. p. 625, *et seq.*; repeated in his Einleitung, p. 402, *et seq.*

He did not wish to visit them personally while irregularities existed that must awaken painful feelings; but had sent them a letter that they might repent, and so prepare for a joyful meeting. The 5th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians *does* contain reproofs, and to it the present passage may be suitably applied.

Another place to which Bleek refers in justification of his opinion is 2 Cor. vii. 8–14. But nothing there requires the assumption of a lost letter; neither the interpretation of the participle translated 'he that suffered wrong,'[1] nor of the phrase, 'our boasting, which I made before Titus.'[2] The former does not mean *Paul himself*, but *the father of the incestuous person*; while the latter, instead of signifying the praise given by Paul to Titus (in a letter now lost), means the commendation of the Corinthians in the presence of Titus before his departure.

If it be thought strange that the apostle should have despatched Titus to Corinth during the critical circumstances of the church in that city without an epistle, it must be remembered that a long letter had been written shortly before; and that the author had neither received an account of the mode in which it had been received, nor of the impression it had made. After so brief an interval it would have been precipitate to despatch another.[3]

These observations must suffice to indicate our dissent from the view of those who assume four epistles to the Corinthians, two of which are lost.

After Titus left the apostle, a violent uproar arose at Ephesus. The success attending his preaching alarmed the selfishness of Demetrius, whose lucrative employment was to manufacture small models of the temple of

[1] ὁ ἀδικηθείς·

[2] ἡ καύχησις ἡμῶν ἡ ἐπὶ Τίτου.

[3] See Rückert's Der zweite Brief Pauli an die Korinther bearbeitet, p. 417, *et seq.*

Artemis. Perceiving that his craft was in danger, this artisan called his workmen together, and easily inflamed their minds against the man whose teaching brought the goddess into disrepute. In consequence of his representations, the artificers ran tumultuously through the city, filling it with confusion. Seizing Aristarchus and Gaius, they hurried them away to the theatre. At length the populace drew forth Alexander from among the multitude; the Jews also putting him forward, that he might exonerate them, by throwing blame on the Christians. But the people would not hear him when they understood that he was a Jew; because Jews as well as Christians were considered enemies to the heathen gods.

After the ignorant rabble had exhausted their fury, the recorder of the city addressed them, quieting their turbulence by reminding them of the illegality of their conduct, and the hazard they ran of being called to account. Hence the meeting dispersed.

EFFECTS OF THE FIRST EPISTLE ON THE CHURCH AT CORINTH, AND STATE OF THE LATTER WHEN THE APOSTLE WROTE HIS SECOND EXTANT ONE.

Leaving Ephesus, Paul proceeded to Troas, where he was disappointed in not meeting Titus, and repaired to Macedonia. Here the messenger returned from Corinth, with a report satisfactory in the main. The letter had produced a salutary impression on the church. The members generally had acknowledged Paul's authority, and evinced their readiness to obey his commands. They expressed regret on account of irregularities, and were anxious to be reconciled to their spiritual father. The incestuous person had been treated according to the will of the apostle; for though the majority had not actually excommunicated him, they had recorded a sentence against him, agreeing with Paul's. The apostle expresses his satisfaction with their resolution, especially

as the offender himself had become penitent; and declares that it need not be carried out. On the contrary, he wishes them to confirm their love to the man by receiving him back to the full communion of the church. The better portion of the people lamented their past conduct, and wished for Paul's return. The intelligence communicated by Titus was so agreeable that the author exults in gratitude to God. 'Now thanks be unto God, which always causeth us to triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest the savour of his knowledge by us in every place.' But all the believers were not reduced to this humble state of mind. Corruptions existed which could not be removed in a day. The love of party lingered among them. The disposition of the majority to submit to the apostle's decisions and welcome him back, was not universal. He had still opponents, who persevered in undermining his reputation; and were, perhaps, all the more inimical, in proportion as the majority acknowledged his rightful claims. This will account for the tone of self-defence in many portions of the letter, the warnings it contains, the severe language adopted. Even in the laudatory passages, side glances at detractors appear. While praising the many, those who continued to thwart him are seldom lost sight of.

The insinuations derogatory to the writer, to which he alludes in the way of refutation or self-defence, are these:—

(*a*). He had said that he intended to proceed directly from Ephesus to Corinth, thence to Macedonia, and returning to Corinth, to stay till his departure for Jerusalem. The distracted state of the church induced him to change his purpose, because he was unwilling to treat them with severity. This alteration of plan his enemies turned to his disadvantage, charging him with fickleness, and inferring that his doctrine could be as little relied on as his promises.

(*b*). They also accused him of vain glory and ostentation, because he spoke of himself so much. They did not distinguish between the grace of God which accompanied him in his work and the human instrument.

(*c*). These opponents directed attention to the contemptibleness of his person, contrasting the severity of his letters with the weakness of his body and worthlessness of his speech. They intimated that he threatened what he could not and would not perform; that however formidable when absent, he was really timid. Being afraid to come, he preferred to threaten at a distance.

Such are the principal charges combated in the second epistle. They may not have been advanced directly or openly. But they were made with persevering enmity.

Who were these contumacious adversaries? Were they the Christ party? Not if that party consisted of such Christians as Schenkel supposes. The persons in question were Judaisers, or Petrine Christians. References to them in chapters iii.; x. 7; xi. 12, 13; xii. 11, cannot be mistaken.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The preceding observations show the occasion on which the epistle was written. The writer's heart was moved with the profoundest feelings of anxiety, fear, affection, distrust, and hope, from the time he had sent his first epistle, till Titus's return from Corinth with a report of the state of the church, favourable in some respects, unpleasant in others. His leading object was to establish his apostolic reputation, and to restore the erring to submission.

The manner in which he tries to accomplish the end is shown by the outline of the letter. Making a distinction between the church generally and the disturbers of its peace, he praises the former, as far as he could with truth; for it was his endeavour to convince them of their faults, and win them to entire obedience.

The latter he seeks to overpower. Beginning with an address to the church generally, so that he could speak in mild terms, he commends their manifestation of repentance and obedience. Praise is bestowed on the whole body; nor is any separation made between the better and the more corrupt members. The writer expresses the same affection for all, and entertains good hopes of them. He proceeds to speak of himself, his life, sufferings, labours, and hopes, presenting the picture of a man deeply conscious of the importance of his office, and pursuing its duties with singular earnestness. The patriot, marked by the absence of vain glory, but by dignity and consciousness of divine power, attracts the reader's admiration. The description flows from a full heart, without the semblance of rhetorical arrangement. The only skill seen is the result of warm outpourings from a heart intensely alive to the cause of truth.

Putting the less important part of the letter between the two leading divisions, the third exhibits an altered tone. Here the writer addresses his opponents, and triumphantly vindicates himself from all their aspersions. He threatens them severely with the exercise of his apostolic power, and invokes God to witness the purity of his motives.

Wieseler's chronological division of the letter into two parts—i.–vii. 1, and vii. 2–xiii. 13 ; the former written before the apostle's meeting with Titus, the latter after it—is baseless.[1] Repetitions are common in Paul's epistles. Why should any argument for separation be founded upon them; or logical arrangement be looked for?

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The epistle was written in Macedonia (ii. 13; vii. 5; ix. 2–4), *at Philippi*, according to the subscription;

[1] Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters, pp. 357, 358.

which place is also in the Vatican MS. but not from the original writer, in the Peshito, in K. L., and many other copies. This is improbable, because he had travelled farther in Macedonia than the place where it is likely he landed, as he speaks of the progress which the churches of the province had made in furthering the collection for the poor (viii. 1, &c.). Besides, he had waited in vain for the arrival of Titus in Macedonia (vii. 5), and anxiety did not allow of a long stay in Philippi, since his object was to go to Corinth immediately. Others suppose Troas to have been its birth-place, and appeal to 2 Cor. ii. 12; though the passage, in its connection with the next verse, proves that Paul had left Troas. Nothing in the epistle favours one locality in Macedonia more than another. Some even think that it was not all written in one place, but at different times and localities on several journeys—an opinion founded on a certain view taken of the letter as loose and disjointed, without order or method.

The exact time of writing cannot be determined. Perhaps it was soon after the first epistle, as various circumstances show; among which we may reckon the allusion to Paul's great peril at Ephesus (2 Cor. i. 4–10), caused by Demetrius—a fact which had happened recently. De Wette, however, disallows the reference of the passage to Acts xix. 23, &c., on the ground that his life was not then in imminent danger, thinking that if Ephesus had been meant, he would have said so, instead of putting 'in Asia.' The latter circumstance is of no weight; and as to the former, it is explained by the strong language which the apostle uses, having the appearance of exaggeration. Others, as Rückert, have thought of a *severe sickness* which the apostle had had, a hypothesis favoured by some expressions, but disagreeing with others. It does not harmonise with 'the sufferings of Christ,' which abounded in the apostle (verse 5); an expression which, in the present

context, is nearly equivalent to the 'affliction' he alludes to. The 19th chapter of the Acts is the best interpreter of the words in i. 8–10, notwithstanding all that Rückert and others allege to the contrary and in favour of a severe sickness. Those who adopt this interpretation, detract nothing from the self-reliance of the apostle, and are far from charging him with a spirit of meanness or cowardice in so doing. He was not a man exempted from fear and anxiety at all times. Is there aught derogatory to his character in believing that sometimes, in the midst of danger, he despaired of life? We think not. If the picture in the Acts be not strictly accordant with Paul's own language, the fault is the historian's, who has embellished his narrative with fictitious circumstances, instead of giving a purely historical description. The letter was composed towards the conclusion of the year in which the first was written, A.D. 57, some time before Paul's three months' sojourn in Achaia. A year did not elapse between the two. The phrase 'a year ago' is too indefinite to have that meaning (2 Cor. viii. 10). The bearers were Titus and two brethren, one of whom was chosen by the Macedonian churches to convey the contribution to Jerusalem. The brother, 'whose praise is in the gospel throughout the churches,' is usually identified with Luke. Others suppose Silas or Silvanus; and De Wette proposes Trophimus. All is conjecture. It is likely that he was unknown to the Corinthians and subordinate to Titus, a circumstance which excludes Luke.

The same uncertainty rests on the other companion of Titus, spoken of in the 8th chapter. He was probably Sosthenes as Burton thinks,[1] though he has been identified with many others.

[1] Theological works, vol. iv. p. 84.

UNITY AND INTEGRITY OF THE EPISTLE.

A few critics have entertained doubts about the integrity of the epistle, in consequence of various difficulties. Three things have occasioned them, as stated by Schleiermacher.[1]

1st. There are opposite statements respecting Titus. Paul requests for him a good reception among the Corinthians (viii. 23, 24); but he asks again, 'Did Titus make a gain of you? Walked we not in the same spirit? Walked we not in the same steps?' (xii. 18). This incongruity is easily removed. Titus had been already at Corinth, to which visit xii. 18 refers. In viii. 23, 24 the writer asks for him a good reception again, when he should carry the present epistle to Corinth.

2nd. There are opposite statements respecting the apostle himself, as if he were now for the first time on the point of coming out of Macedonia (ix. 4), and again, as if he had been already at Corinth a second time (xii. 14; xiii. 1, 2), the latter of which cannot be reconciled with the narrative in the Acts.

This has been already explained.

3rd. A very different tone prevails at the beginning and end of the epistle. From being laudatory and mild, it becomes severe and harsh.

The writer had different parties in view. In the first part he speaks to the body of the church; in the last to the Jewish Christians who continued to resist and calumniate him.

The modes of dismemberment adopted by Semler, Weber, Greeve, and Van Vloten, which impugn the integrity of the letter, hardly deserve mention. Those who wish to see them may consult Bertholdt's Introduction. The procedure has been renewed by Weisse,

[1] Einleitung in's Neue Testament, pp. 154, 155.

in a less objectionable form; and Wieseler has only gone so far as to divide the epistle into two parts —one written before, the other after, Titus's return. Repetitions and change of tone have appeared strange to these critics, though they are perfectly consistent with the integrity of the letter; nor does any good reason exist for supposing its original compass to have been different from the present. The complex feelings of the apostle, and the circumstances in which he was placed in Macedonia at the time of writing, sufficiently account for the looseness of parts and varying tone. Besides, the divided state of the church, between the Pauline and Petrine Christians, required that praise and blame should be blended.

DICTION AND STYLE.

The language of the epistle has been severely criticised by Eichhorn and Emmerling. Others follow their example, in a less offensive way. It cannot be denied, that the mode of writing is rugged and awkward; harsher, obscurer, and looser than in Paul's other writings. Parentheses and digressions intersect the narrative, and disturb its sequence. Sentences are broken off, without any apparent reason for the interruption; and the tone is sometimes inflated. The epistle has neither the ease nor smoothness of the first. Examples may be seen in v. 1–4, where there is a mixture of figures and some confusion of idea, causing great perplexity to interpreters. Other passages, as i. 3–7; x. 12–16, show a consciousness of obscurity in the mind of the writer, in consequence of which, he subjoined synonymous expressions, causing prolixity without clearness. The sense of viii. 11 is obscure; so much so, that an inversion of the clauses has been assumed. The diction is laboured. Chap. vii. ver. 8 is awkwardly expressed, and the true meaning difficult to be seen.

In i. 11, the construction is doubtful and imperfect; xi. 6 is difficult, because the words are not the same as in Phil. iv. 12. The case has been overstated by Eichhorn and Emmerling; for several of their accusations and criticisms will not stand. But any careful reader sees enough to convince him that the style and diction are inferior to Paul's usual mode. Roughness, obscurity, looseness, careless constructions, are frequent. The haste with which the letter was written, and the intense emotions agitating the apostle's bosom, as he travelled from place to place in Macedonia, help to explain the phenomena. The ideas are worthy of the great apostle; but they are clothed in a negligent garb. He never writes good Hellenistic Greek; but he was capable of expressing his conceptions in smooth and appropriate language. If he did not on this occasion, peculiar circumstances caused the difference. Objective and subjective phenomena account for it.

Rückert takes a very favourable view of the whole epistle, in structure, language, and adaptation to its object, pronouncing it a true masterpiece of rhetorical art; a judgment erring as much on one side, as Eichhorn's does on the other. In like manner, Meyer speaks of 'the oratorical art' conspicuous in the epistle, an expression liable to convey an erroneous idea, unless it be strictly defined; for, in one sense, there is an absence of art. The rhetoric is powerful and sharp, but has no studied arrangement. Without art, it produces all the impression and more, of the best rhetoric fashioned after the most approved models. The letter is a spontaneous effusion, dictated in haste, unrevised; often irregular; uneven, inelegant; sometimes inflated, yet having remarkable delicacy and propriety; weighty, striking, severe. In defending the epistle from the charges brought against it, Hug prudently confines himself to the general outline and distribution of parts, without entering into matters of

diction, sentence-making, and such like. It is unfortunate that some critics, perceiving an overstrained view in one or more of their predecessors, should allow their zeal to carry them in a contrary direction. So is it with Rückert in this case. Meyer himself errs somewhat because of his desire to differ from De Wette.

AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the letter has not been questioned except by Bruno Bauer. It is confirmed by the contents of the first epistle, and abundantly attested by early witnesses.

Irenaeus writes: 'Paul has plainly said in the second to the Corinthians, "In whom the God of this world has blinded the minds of the unbelievers."' [1]

Clement of Alexandria has the following: 'The apostle calls the common doctrine of the faith a savour of knowledge in the second to the Corinthians, for until this day the same veil remains,' &c. [2] Again: 'Hence also Paul—Ye have these promises, says he, dearly beloved; let us cleanse our hearts from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit, perfecting holiness in the fear of God.' [3]

Tertullian writes: 'For indeed they suppose that the apostle Paul in the second of the Corinthians forgave the same fornicator who he had declared in the first

[1] Quod autem dicunt, aperte Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios dixisse: 'In quibus deus seculi hujus excaecavit mentes infidelium.'—*Contra Haeres.* iii. 7, § 1.

[2] Ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τῆς γνώσεως ὁ ἀπόστολος τὴν δὲ κοινὴν διδασκαλίαν τῆς πίστεως ὀσμὴν γνώσεως εἴρηκεν, ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ πρὸς Κορινθίους, Ἄχρι γὰρ τῆς σήμερον ἡμέρας, τὸ αὐτὸ κάλυμμα, κ.τ.λ.—*Stromata*, iv. c. 16, p. 608, ed. Potter.

[3] Ὅθεν καὶ ὁ Παῦλος . . . . Ταύτας οὖν ἔχετε τὰς ἐπαγγελίας, φησίν, ἀγαπητοί· καθαρίσωμεν ἑαυτῶν τὰς καρδίας ἀπὸ παντὸς μολυσμοῦ σαρκὸς καὶ πνεύματος, ἐπιτελοῦντες ἁγιωσύνην ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ.—*Strom.* iii. c. 11, p. 544, ed. Potter.

ought to be delivered to Satan for the destruction of the flesh.'[1]

Cyprian has the following: 'Likewise the blessed apostle Paul, full of the inspiration of the Lord, "Now he that ministereth," says he, "seed to the sower, will both minister bread,"' &c.[2] It is useless to multiply testimonies where they are not needed.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts: 1. i.-vii; 2. viii. ix.; 3. x.–xiii.

The first contains the apostle's utterances respecting his personal fortunes, purposes, feelings, and desires during the interval between the former epistle and the present; allusions to the long-expected and favourable accounts he had received of the believers by Titus, and assertion of the dignity of his apostolic office, with the disinterested manner in which he had fulfilled it among the Corinthians.

The following paragraphs are contained in it: i. 3–14; 15–24; ii. 1–11; 12–17; iii.; iv.–vi. 10; vi. 11–vii. 16.

After the usual introduction, he thanks God for the consolation he had received in all his sufferings, and for the ability to comfort others in like circumstances; which leads him to refer to the imminent danger from which he had been recently delivered, owing in part to their prayers. Such intercession he expected from them because of his good conscience (i. 1–14). He then defends himself against the charge of fickleness because he had altered his purpose of visiting them in person, assuring them that it was not from fear or ver-

[1] Revera enim suspicantur, Paulum in secunda ad Corinthios eidem fornicatori veniam dedisse, quem in prima dedendum Satanae in interitum carnis pronuntiarit, etc.—*De Pudicitia*, c. 13.

[2] Item beatus apostolus Paulus, dominicae inspirationis gratia plenus, 'Qui administrat, inquit,' etc.—*De opere et eleemos.* ix. p. 608, ed. Migne.

satility of mind, but out of tenderness towards them (15–24). The mention of his desire not to give them pain brings up the subject of his former letter, with the case of the incestuous person. It was for this reason he wrote that epistle, with a troubled heart. Now he is satisfied with the discipline which the church had administered to the offender by his recommendation, and wishes the penitent to be restored (ii. 1–11). He proceeds to express his affection for them, and the anxiety he felt when he did not meet Titus at Troas, and travelled to Macedonia hoping to find him there. But the intelligence he received at last was so welcome, that he breaks forth into an expression of praise to God who caused him always to triumph. In this manner he passes to himself (12–17). To obviate the suspicion of vain glory he appeals to what he had done at Corinth, but is careful to ascribe to God all the ability that made him an efficient minister of the new covenant. This leads him to contrast the old with the new dispensation, and to touch upon the blindness of the Jewish nation as though a veil were on their minds during the reading of the Old Testament (iii.).

Returning to the frankness and freedom of his preaching, he states that he taught the whole truth without falsification, though it might not be received by all. He did not proclaim it with a view of exalting self, or with a mixture of selfish motives, but announced nothing except the pure light of the gospel, which God had made to shine in his heart. Conscious that he had been called to the apostolic work, he did not lose courage or confidence even amid sufferings; but knowing the living power of Christ in him, he was supported amid exposures to death, as he looked forward to the future glory that swallows up the remembrance of these light afflictions. To that eternal state he had regard, else he could not have acted and suffered as he did. But he knew that after laying aside the earthly

body he should have a spiritual one. With such hope, and remembering that all must stand before the judgment seat of Christ, he could appeal to the Corinthians in attestation of his fidelity. Animated by the love of Christ who died for all, the apostle did not live to himself but to the Saviour; not attaching importance to the earthly conditions of men, nor entertaining carnal ideas of the Messiah any more. In Christ everything becomes new, by reconciliation to God; and the commission to offer that reconciliation had been entrusted to the writer. As an ambassador for Christ, therefore, he beseeches his readers to be reconciled to God and become subjects of righteousness. Exhorting them not to restrain the grace of God as if they had received it in vain, he returns to himself in the duties of his office, stating that he had been very careful to give no offence, at all times, in all circumstances and places; in prosperity and adversity; in thought, word, and deed; in good and bad report; by life or death (iv.–vi. 10).

To this pathetic address he subjoins various admonitions, warning the readers against association with the idolatrous heathen, lest they should be seduced into sin. As he begins to speak of the intelligence brought by Titus, and the effects of his first letter, he says: 'Understand me aright; ascribe no evil design to me in writing the former letter. I have given you no cause to think so by my apostolic conduct in relation to you.' He had been uneasy till he heard of their repentance from Titus: then he was filled with joy. He was glad that his letter had affected them so much; not that he took any pleasure in reproving, but rejoiced in the repentance of the guilty. The result had been the very thing he had in view. He could therefore repeat his former glorying in the converts at Corinth, rejoicing that Titus himself had returned well pleased (vi. 11–vii. 16).

2. In the second part, the writer encourages the Corinthians to complete the contribution they had begun to make for the poor Christians in Judea; for which purpose he had sent Titus and two others to promote the work.

The apostle boasts of the liberal spirit displayed by the Macedonian churches, who had made a considerable contribution for the use of the poor believers in Judea though in narrow circumstances themselves. He had desired Titus to call upon them to complete the work; and hoped they would abound in liberality; not that he commanded it, but showed that such conduct was conformable to the example of Christ, who denied Himself for the good of mankind. And as they had begun to be generous a year ago, he hoped they would justify his good opinion of them. He did not mean that they should do all, and other churches nothing; but that they should give according to their ability. He had sent Titus to finish the matter, because the latter had a tender concern for them; and with him two brethren of tried principle, hoping that the Corinthians would justify his assertions in other churches respecting their liberality. In exhorting them to be generous, he reminds them that as they sowed in the present life, they might expect to reap hereafter; and that their liberality would promote the honour of God as well as the advancement of Christianity (viii. ix.).

3. He now assumes a severe tone towards the refractory enemies among them, asserts his apostolic power, exposes the false apostles who attempted to subvert his authority, and speaks reluctantly of his own merits, not from vain glory, but concern for their good.

He beseeches the Corinthians not to compel him to use severity at his coming among them. Against his opponents he affirms, that Christ had armed him with authority, and that he should exercise it toward those who pretended that his letters only had weight, his

bodily presence being mean, and his speech contemptible, so that he durst not act or speak so boldly among them as his writing would indicate. He does not boast, as some of his enemies had done, of the fruits of other men's labours; nor does he assume the credit of anything which he had not really done; but hopes that through their instrumentality the kingdom of Christ would extend to surrounding regions. Far from praising himself on account of what had been done, he glories in the Lord alone (x. 1–18).

He now asks their indulgence for venturing to boast of himself, which he does out of solicitude for them, lest they should become estranged from him by the representations of other teachers. He believes that he is not inferior to the false apostles. Though unskilful in oratory, he is not deficient in knowledge. They had had abundant opportunities of proving his character. He refers them to his laborious services in preaching the gospel gratuitously; avowing his determination not to abandon that course, that his opponents might be deprived of a pretext for assigning unworthy motives. As for those adversaries, he charges them with deceitfulness, hypocrisy, and falsehood; and while indulging again in boasting, he apologises for it. In claiming for himself qualifications and prerogatives equal to those of his enemies, he enumerates the perils he had suffered for the gospel's sake (xi.).

In the same boastful strain, visions and revelations are referred to, one in particular by way of example. But that ground is soon left and his infirmities dwelt upon. In excusing his boastful tone, he speaks of the signs he had wrought among them when he planted the truth in their midst; and of his perfect disinterestedness. Not only did he act so himself but his messengers followed the example, taking no temporal support from the Corinthians. All this he adduces, not so much from a wish to defend himself, as for their

edification. Afraid that their factions were not done away, he anticipates grief on account of vices retained by some (xii.).

After telling them that he was about to visit them the third time, he announces the severe procedure he would follow at his coming. Since they wanted a proof of the power of Christ in him, they should find him able to give it. But he exhorts them to self-examination, hoping to be spared the necessity of severity. The letter concludes with a recommendation of unity, peace, and love; and a comprehensive prayer is offered, that the grace of Christ, the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit might be with them all (xiii.).

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries on the two epistles to the Corinthians, are those of De Wette, 1855; Meyer, 1862; Neander, 1859; Rückert, 1836, 1837; Osiander, 1849, 1858; Ewald, 1857; and Stanley, 1855.

EPISTLE TO THE GALATIANS.

INTRODUCTION OF CHRISTIANITY AMONG THE GALATIANS.

GALATIA, or Gallo-graecia, was a province of Asia Minor, differing in extent at different times. It was peopled by Gauls or Celts, about 280 B.C., who, refusing to take part in the expedition of the main body against Greece, and joined by a portion of the repulsed army, pushed forward from Thrace, where they had settled for a time, to the Hellespont, crossed over to the opposite shore, and overran Asia Minor. Their leaders were Leonnorius and Lutarius. They were invited by Nicomedes king of Bithynia to assist him against his brother, and rewarded with a portion of Bithynia. But they were not easily restrained from incursions on their neighbours, and became formidable in their depredations. Princes followed the pernicious example of Nicomedes; and few wars were undertaken without their co-operation. Their name became so formidable that the kings of Syria paid them tribute. At length they received an effectual check from Attalus king of Pergamus, who drove them back, confining them to the fertile plains bordering on the Halys between that river and the Sangarius. Here in ancient Phrygia they became incorporated with the original inhabitants and Greek settlers; and were called Gallo-graeci or Grecian Gauls, by the Romans. They appear to have retained their own language, customs, and institutions for a long time; since Jerome, in the fourth century, says their tongue

was nearly the same as that of the Treviri. Along with Celtic, their vernacular language, they spoke Greek; the latter being used in public inscriptions and monuments. In the year 189 B.C. they were subjugated by the consul C. Manlius Vulso, and brought under the Roman yoke. They were still allowed, however, to have their own princes, the last of whom was Amyntas, murdered B.C. 26; when Augustus converted Galatia into a Roman province, governed by a President.[1]

Galatia in the New Testament may be either Galatia proper, that comparatively small tract of land in the interior of Asia Minor, within which Attalus confined the restless Gauls; or the larger kingdom of Amyntas, which was converted into a Roman province, including portions of Lycaonia, Pisidia, and Phrygia. Many critics have supported the opinion that the Galatians of the Roman province are intended by Luke, in which case Derbe and Lystra in Lycaonia, with Antioch in Pisidia, were Galatian cities. Iconium was not,[2] because the south-eastern part of Lycaonia did not belong to the Roman province, as Böttger[3] supposes. It is therefore argued, that the Galatian churches consisted of Lycaonian and Pisidian Christians, the former chiefly in Derbe and Lystra, the latter in Antioch. But the New Testament does not seem to adopt the official appellation of Galatia, because Lycaonia is mentioned separately in the Acts of the Apostles, implying the use of Galatia proper (Acts xvi. 1–6; xviii. 23). Derbe and Lystra are expressly called cities of Lycaonia (xiv. 6). The popular acceptation of Galatia is favoured by the parallel examples of Phrygia, Mysia, Pisidia in the Acts, which occur in their geographical, not their political sense. Hence Galatia proper must be meant, not the more extended

[1] Mynster's Kleine theologische Schriften, p. 51, *et seq.*

[2] See Rückert's Magazin für Exegese und Theologie des N. T., erste Lieferung, pp. 97-112.

[3] Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Paulinischen Briefe, dritte Abtheilung, § 1.

Roman province, whose churches were chiefly in the leading towns, Ancyra, Tavium, Pessinus, and Gordium. Lystra, Derbe, Antioch in Pisidia are excluded. Böttger is incorrect in restricting the churches which Paul founded to the southern parts of the Roman province, i.e. to Pisidia and Lycaonia.

The Gallic religion was sensuous and external, consisting in rites and cruel ceremonies. The Phrygian worship of Cybele presented points of attraction to the Celts, since it also appealed to the senses and excited the passions of men. It is probable that the Galatians united the worship of Cybele with that of the Gallic deities. The commerce carried on in their chief towns drew a number of Jews to them, who, according to Josephus, enjoyed considerable privileges. These Jews were doubtless solicitous to propagate their religion, and had made many proselytes.

The first time the apostle Paul visited Galatia was on his second missionary journey, as related in the Acts of the Apostles. 'Now when they had gone throughout Phrygia and the region of Galatia, and were forbidden by the Holy Ghost to preach the word in Asia,' &c. The conversion of the Galatians took place on this occasion, since the Asia which the apostle was forbidden to preach in was not Asia Minor, but *proconsular* Asia (Acts xvi. 6). When Paul set forth on his third missionary journey from Antioch, he came a second time to Galatia, as we infer from Acts xviii. 23. 'And after he had spent some time there (at Antioch) he departed, and went over all the country of Galatia and Phrygia in order, strengthening all the disciples.' The word *strengthening* or *confirming*, implies that the inhabitants had been already converted. Thus two visits are distinctly marked.

A journey prior to these two is not intimated in Acts xiv. 6, though Koppe and others think so. 'The region that lieth round about' does not mean Galatia, but the

region about Derbe and Lystra, cities which are assigned to Lycaonia. We know indeed that Galatia, as a Roman province, included parts of Lycaonia and Pisidia; but there are good reasons for believing that the word Galatia was used by the sacred writers in its popular sense, not in the wider and official one. The language of Gal. ii. 13 does not imply that the Galatians were personally acquainted with Barnabas, and cannot lead to the conclusion that they had received a visit from Paul and Barnabas together, one at the time referred to in Acts xiv. 6. Koppe refers to the fact that the object of Paul's second missionary journey, as noticed in Acts xv. 36, xvi. 4–6, was *to confirm* the churches; but it is sufficient to reply that those whose faith was strengthened on that journey do not include the Galatians, the subject being changed at xvi. 5, where the Galatians are introduced.

TIME AND PLACE AT WHICH THE EPISTLE WAS WRITTEN.

The letter has been put at the two extremes of date. According to some, it was the first of Paul's; according to others, the last. It stood first in Marcion's canon, as we learn from Tertullian,[1] but it is uncertain whether the list was arranged on the chronological principle. Tertullian's opinion seems to have been that it was not; whatever that opinion be worth. In modern times, the view that it is the earliest Pauline writing has been held by respectable critics, including Michaelis and Koppe; though no proper argument can be adduced in its favour. The other extreme is that of Koehler and Schrader, the former of whom brings it down to A.D. 69, two years after Nero's death; while the latter dates it A.D. 64, in the [one] Roman imprisonment. Intermediate dates are numerous.

[1] Adv. Marcion. v. 2, vol. i. p. 316, ed. Semler.

It was written after St. Paul's second visit to the Galatians, because there are intimations of his having been twice with them: 'Of the which I tell you before, as I have also told you in time past, that they which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God' (v. 21). The context shows that the second visit, not the first, is implied. 'Am I, therefore, become your enemy, because I tell you the truth?' (iv. 16); or rather, 'Am I, therefore, hated by you, because I told you the truth?' on his second visit in all probability. 'Ye know how, through infirmity of the flesh, I preached the gospel unto you *at the first*' (iv. 13). This language agrees best with a second visit, for the expression translated *at the first*,[1] denotes properly 'on the former of two occasions.' The expression, indeed, *may* mean nothing more than a time antecedent to that in which Paul wrote, as Fritzsche and Usteri understand it: but the former sense is the more probable. The apostle need not, and perhaps would not, have used the word at all, had he visited the Galatians but once before writing. While it must be confessed, that these notices are not striking or decisive proofs that the writer had made a second visit to his readers, they contain probable evidence of it.

The churches of Galatia were founded A.D. 52; they were revisited by the apostle in 55. Hence the epistle was written in or after the year A.D. 55. How long after? Immediately, according to those critics who rely on the expression 'so soon,' in i. 6. 'I marvel that ye are *so soon* changing from him that called you,' &c.; that is, shortly after his second visit. This interpretation, however, is precarious, because the context seems to limit the expression to the time of their conversion, not to that of his last leaving them. The change was speedy and unexpected. After embracing the gospel they soon fell away, and adopted opinions at variance with it.

[1] τὸ πρότερον.

The phrase contributes little to a settlement of the date.

After travelling through Galatia and Phrygia, where he confirmed the believers, the apostle repaired to Ephesus, abode there nearly three years, and wrote the epistle after hearing of the Galatian apostasy. So many think. At what period of the sojourn, whether at its commencement, middle, or close, must be matter of conjecture. In other words, the epistle may have been written 55, 56, or 57, if it be dated at Ephesus. In confirmation of this place a passage in the first epistle to the Corinthians has been adduced. 'Now concerning the collection for the saints, as I have given order to the churches of Galatia, even so do ye' (xvi. 1). As this injunction respecting a collection is not in the Galatian epistle, Cappellus conjectured that the latter was written immediately before that to the Corinthians; that Paul gave the bearer a verbal message about the money; and that the injunction being fresh in his mind when he began the epistle to the Corinthians, gave rise to the allusion. As, therefore, the writing of the Galatian letter was almost simultaneous with that of the first to the Corinthians, the place was the same, viz. Ephesus. The argument is perhaps more ingenious than valid, because the apostle may have given directions about the collection when he last visited the Galatians. Some will think it more pertinent to compare various passages in the two epistles, showing the same ideas to have been in the writer's mind when composing them. In both he alludes to his infirmity in the flesh (Gal. iv. 13; 1 Cor. ii. 3). The same proverb is quoted in Gal. v. 9; 1 Cor. v. 6. Gal. v. 6; vi. 15 may also be compared with 1 Cor. vii. 19. But if similarities in idea and diction contribute to settle the date of an epistle, they are more numerous in relation to the second epistle to the Corinthians. Compare Gal. iii. 13 with 2 Cor. v. 21; vi. 7 with 2 Cor. ix. 6; i. 6 with 2 Cor. xi. 4; vi. 15 with

2 Cor. v. 17; iv. 17 with 2 Cor. xi. 2; i. 10 with 2 Cor. v. 11; i. 9, v. 21 with 2 Cor. xiii. 2; iii. 3 with 2 Cor. viii. 6. Several words are also peculiar to the two Pauline epistles.[1] Professor Jowett has also pointed out the similarity of tone and feeling in them;[2] to which may be added the cognate manner of dealing with antagonists. The affinities in question bring the epistle nearer the second to the Corinthians than the first; and reduce it to a later date. In pursuance of the same method, a comparison of the Galatian with the Roman epistle furnishes a closer parallel. Both set forth the relation of the law to the gospel, showing the inefficacy of the former to confer righteousness. Justification by faith without the deeds of the law is their common theme, in opposition to a Judaising tendency. The following table of parallels shows the striking coincidences of thought and diction between the two.

GALATIANS.	ROMANS.
ii. 16.—For by the works of the law shall no flesh be justified.	iii. 20.—By the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight.
ii. 19.—For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God.	vii. 4.—Wherefore my brethren ye also are become dead to the law by the body of Christ.
iii. 6.—Even as Abraham believed God and it was accounted to him for righteousness.	iv. 3.—Abraham believed God and it was counted unto him for righteousness.
iii. 7.—They which are of faith, the same are the children of Abraham.	iv. 11.—That he might be the father of all them that believe.
iii. 8.—And the Scripture, foreseeing that God would justify the heathen through faith, preached before the gospel unto Abraham, saying, In thee shall all nations be blessed.	iv. 17, 18.—As it is written, I have made thee a father of many nations. . . . . So shall thy seed be.

[1] ἀπορεῖσθαι, κανών, κυροῦν, τοὐναντίον, φοβεῖσθαι, μήπως, κατεσθίειν metaphorically.

[2] The epistles of St. Paul to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, &c., vol. i. p. 243, 2nd ed.

GALATIANS.	ROMANS.
iii. 9.—So then, they which be of faith are blessed with faithful Abraham.	iv. 23, 24.—Now it was not written for his sake alone . . . but for us also, to whom it shall be imputed, if we believe that Jesus, &c.
iii. 10.—For as many as are of the works of the law are under the curse, &c.	iv. 15.—Because the law worketh wrath.
iii. 11.—But that no man is justified by the law in the sight of God it is evident, for, The just shall live by faith.	iii. 21; i. 17.—But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifested, being witnessed by the law and the prophets, &c.
iii. 12.—And the law is not of faith, but the man that doeth them shall live in them.	x. 5.—For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man who doeth those things shall live in them.
iii. 15-18.	iv. 13, 14, 16.
iii. 22.—But the Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe.	xi. 32.—God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all.
iii. 27.—As many of you as have been baptized into Christ have put on Christ.	vi. 3.—Know ye not that so many of us as were baptized into Jesus Christ, &c.
iii. 29.—And if ye be Christ's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise.	ix. 8.—The children of the promise are counted for the seed.
iv. 5, 6.—To redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons God hath sent forth the spirit of his Son into your hearts crying, Abba, Father. Wherefore thou art no more a servant but a son; and if a son then an heir of God through Christ.	viii. 14-17.—For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God. For ye have not received the spirit of bondage again to fear, but ye have received the spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The Spirit itself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are the children of God: and if children, then heirs; heirs of God and joint heirs with Christ, &c.
iv. 28.—Now we, brethren, as Isaac was, are the children of the promise.	ix. 7.—In Isaac shall thy seed be called.
v. 14.—All the law is fulfilled in one word, even in this, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.	xiii. 8-10.—He that loveth another hath fulfilled the law . . . and if there be any other commandment, it is briefly comprehended in this saying, namely, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as

GALATIANS.	ROMANS.
	thyself . . . love is the fulfilment of the law.
v. 16.—Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfil the lust of the flesh.	viii. 1.—Who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.
v. 17.—For the flesh lusteth against the spirit and the spirit against the flesh, and these are contrary the one to the other, So that ye cannot do the things that ye would.	vii. 13-25.—With the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin.
	vii. 15.—What I would, that I do not, but what I hate, that I do.
vi. 2.—Bear ye one another's burdens.	xv. 1.—We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak.

In addition to these coincidences of thought and expression, a number of words are peculiar to both Pauline epistles.[1]

We attach considerable weight to a parallelism so striking. Taking into consideration the similarity between the epistles to the Corinthians, especially the second, and the Galatian letter, with the more striking similarity of the latter to the epistle to the Romans, it is natural to place the Galatian letter between the two to the Corinthians, and the one addressed to the Romans. Nearer the last than the former two, because of the greater affinity. The same leading ideas occupied the apostle's mind, and have been expressed in similar diction. But the epistles themselves could scarcely indicate the order in which those to the Romans and Galatians should follow one another. It is true that Dr. Lightfoot attempts to trace the order first and second Corinthians, Galatians, Romans, in the history of Paul's personal sufferings, and in the progress of his controversy with the Judaising opponents,[2] but with precarious success; for, according to Baur, the progress of the conflict with the Judaisers is supposed to have

[1] Βαστάζειν, δουλεία, ἐλευθεροῦν, ἴδε, κατὰ ἄνθρωπον λέγω, κῶμοι, μακαρισμός, μέθαι, οἱ τὰ τοιαῦτα πράσσοντες, ὀφειλέτης, παραβάτης, παρ' ὅ; τί ἔτι; τί λέγει ἡ γραφή;

[2] Saint Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, p. 50, *et seq.* 2nd ed.

passed its first stage in the Corinthian epistles, where the opposition is of a different nature from that seen in the Galatian epistle. The first ground of attack, circumcision, is abandoned; and the adversaries at Corinth proceed more methodically and with greater reflectiveness, directing their attack against the apostle's person. This view is as plausible as Lightfoot's, if not more so; and gives the order Galatians, Corinthians, Romans. In both methods of reasoning we can see but little validity—none whatever in the attempt to trace the sequence of the epistles by means of Paul's personal sufferings or feelings. The tactics of the Judaisers were different in different places. Apart from all this, Paul's moods varied, not merely according to his personal sufferings of which we know little, or according to the opposition of Judaisers, but as the result of those innate promptings of which he was the subject in a peculiar degree—the passionate outbursts of sentiment, which assumed a general or more limited shape without rule.

There is no good reason for dating the epistle prior to the first and second to the Corinthians. On the contrary, it should be nearer to the Roman letter which was written at Corinth during Paul's three months' abode there. The same ideas are sketched in strong outline which the epistle to the Romans presents in a more systematic and polished form. The argument is the same; the treatment different. This does not necessarily imply its priority, because the state of the churches, their relative importance, and the diversified operations of the Judaisers in them, might account for the difference. Hence we are not required to believe that the theme expanded in the apostle's mind with deliberation, till it swelled out into the great theological argument of the epistle to the Romans. Though briefer than the letter addressed to the church of the metropolis and less refined, the character of the persons may have caused all the difference. Yet it is probable that it preceded

that to the Romans. It is admitted that a rude sketch usually goes before a finished model; but we cannot describe the respective epistles in these terms, for the apostle's procedure was as far as possible from an artist's or sculptor's. He was swayed by strong emotions going out towards the churches according to his knowledge of their state, or the influence of erroneous teachers among them. The fickle and sensuous Galatians, in whom the Celtic element was still visible, who threw themselves vehemently into a new phase of opinion and receded as suddenly, required stronger and coarser nourishment than the Roman or Corinthian converts. It was as easy for the apostle to pass from the more systematic to the less, from the more extended to the briefer argument, as the reverse, had he so willed. But the leaven had proceeded far enough to call forth his reproofs as soon as he came to the knowledge of the churches in Galatia. Matters there were in a critical state. In the Roman church it was not so.

We date the letter at Corinth prior to the Roman one, i.e. A.D. 57 or rather 58; according to the opinion of Grotius, Pearson, and others. The only objection to so late a date is the expression 'I marvel that ye are *so soon* changing,' &c., i.e. so soon after your conversion, whereas they had embraced Christianity six years before. But the phrase is comparative, depending on the measure of the person who uses it. It may refer to time measured by the importance of a thing; so that long and short vary according to the subjects about which they are employed. The Galatian apostasy was speedy, considering the labour bestowed on them by the apostle and their enthusiastic reception of his message.

The subscription, 'from Rome,' expresses a very ancient opinion, that of Theodoret and Jerome, of B**, K.L., and the two Syriac versions. But ℵ, A., B*., C. have no place. The bearer of the letter is not known. Macknight fixes upon Titus, because as a Greek he was

much interested in the doctrine established; and also, because being present at the Jerusalem council he could attest what took place there. This is conjecture. Perhaps Titus would have been mentioned had he been the bearer; for he was of more note than Tychicus the bearer of the Colossian epistle, who is named. The point is of no importance.

THE APOSTLE'S ADVERSARIES IN THE GALATIAN CHURCHES.

It is probable that a few emissaries had been sent into Galatia who began the strong Judaising tendency, and soon gained over converts that became influential Judaisers. One person, who was leader of the anti-pauline party, seems pointed at in v. 10, 'He that troubleth you shall bear his judgment, whosoever he be.'

It is difficult to tell who were the most active Judaisers among the Galatians themselves. They may have been recent converts among the Gentile Christians to the sentiments of the party which had its principal seat in Palestine. If this be so, they had been persuaded to associate Judaism with their simple Christianity, thinking both necessary to salvation. So Neander supposes, appealing to the passage in vi. 12, 13: 'As many as desire to make a fair show in the flesh, they constrain you to be circumcised, only lest they should suffer persecution for the cross of Christ. For neither they themselves who are circumcised keep the law, but desire to have you circumcised, that they may glory in your flesh.' The word translated 'they who are circumcised,'[1] may either be the present participle or the perfect passive. Lachmann prefers the latter. The former or received reading deserves the preference. Neander, who adopts it, appears to think it decisive

[1] οἱ περιτεμνόμενοι or οἱ περιτετμημένοι (vi. 13).

against the assumption that the agitators were circumcised Jews and *for* the interpretation that they were Gentiles who suffered themselves to be circumcised. The expression seems to us equally applicable to converted Jews or converted proselytes.

Olshausen, again, supposes that the most influential seducers of the Galatian churches were Jews by birth, who after embracing Christianity were easily induced to retain the essential part of their former faith.

A third opinion is, that they were proselytes from among the heathen to Judaism before Christianity had been planted in the country, and having embraced the gospel, united their former with their new faith.

There is no reason for limiting the truth to one or other of these views exclusively. The agitators probably consisted of converted Jews, converted proselytes, and some Gentiles who submitted to circumcision; of the first class perhaps more than of the second; and of the second more than the third. All are compatible with the received reading in vi. 13. They were Jewish Christians generally.

In prosecuting their design to bring the Galatians under the yoke of the law, the false teachers industriously circulated various calumnies against Paul. They attacked his apostleship, affirming that he had not been called immediately by Christ to the office like the primitive apostles; but that he received his commission from men. He had not been taught Christianity by the true apostles, and therefore his knowledge was inferior to theirs. They asserted that Peter and his colleagues required the circumcision of Gentile converts; and that there was an inconsistency between them and Paul in this respect.

These Judaisers did not labour in vain. The impulsive Galatians, true to the Celtic element of their nature, soon changed. Many submitted to circumcision and were ready to keep the Jewish feasts. Thus the aspect

of their Christianity was disfigured; and religion, to them, consisted in external and sensuous things rather than faith or inward purity. The apostle meets and refutes all such errors, vindicating himself with triumphant success, and openly asserting the independence and freedom of his gospel. The refuge of lies to which his enemies had recourse is swept away with a torrent of bold argument, which places his doctrine and conduct in the broad light of ingenuous truth.

The occasion of his writing is evident from these remarks. The apostasy of the converts, who had turned to the weak and beggarly elements of the law was sufficient to call forth his reproofs. The fruit of his labours among them was being frustrated by injurious influences that needed to be withstood. They had to be brought back, if possible, to the simple truth they had forsaken—to be taught again the first elements of Christianity—justification by faith without works.

STATE OF THE CHURCHES WHEN VISITED BY PAUL A SECOND TIME.

The state of the Galatian churches at the time of Paul's second visit, compared with that in which he had left them, can scarcely be ascertained. He may have found everything encouraging, because they had remained steadfast in the faith; especially as the book of Acts says he *confirmed* the brethren, imprinting on their minds afresh the lessons he had taught before. But we do not believe this to be a correct representation of their state. After his first visit, it is likely that the Judaisers were not idle. Attempts had been made during his absence, to inculcate upon the converts the observance of the Mosaic law. The germ, at least, of the errors into which they afterwards fell, had appeared. The apostle had seen the leaven which had been fermenting in his absence; so that the state of the churches

was neither sound nor satisfactory when he went a second time. Under the circumstances, he must have endeavoured to prevent the development of the principles which had taken root. Rebuking the perverse maxims of the false teachers, he exposed their corruption of the gospel, and put a stop for the time to the incipient apostasy of the converts. His presence allayed their doubts. But his reproofs, and earnest endeavours to eradicate the errors in question, had only a temporary effect. He had repressed without removing the evil, which broke forth again in a more aggravated form.

This view is most consonant with such passages as i. 9; iv. 12, 18; v. 3–21, though they may also consist with the assumption, that no defection had taken place at the time of his second visit. Yet it is difficult to believe, that the errorists did not make their appearance among the converts for about two or three years. It is not likely that they would be inactive there so long; or that their operations should not begin till after the apostle's second visit. In the absence of definite evidence to the contrary, it is natural to suppose that the Galatians had fallen away in the course of the first three years after their conversion. Bleek[1] assumes, that the apostle had just heard of the appearance of the Judaisers among the Galatians when he wrote, appealing to i. 6; iii. 1; iv. 19; v. 10, &c. If so, the parties had exercised no influence before Paul's second visit. The passages in question are not decisive in favour of this opinion and agree with the other.

COMPOSITION OF THE GALATIAN CHURCHES.

The mass of those to whom the epistle is addressed, were Gentile converts, as is plain from iv. 8: 'When ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.' Yet it is immediately added, that they

[1] Einleitung in das neue Testament, p. 419.

turned again to the weak and beggarly elements of the law. Paul also employs arguments from the Old Testament and rabbinical modes of interpretation, involving an acquaintance with the Jewish Scriptures on the part of his readers. Were the churches then divided between Jews and Gentiles, so that the writer turns from the one to the other as his argument leads? This can hardly be asserted in the face of iv. 8, 9, where the same persons in both verses are apparently Gentiles and Jews. No distinction is made between the case of the two classes respecting the obligation of circumcision, for it is said to all, 'if ye be circumcised, Christ shall profit you nothing.' It must therefore be assumed that the Galatians were Gentiles, who had been proselytes to Judaism before their conversion by Paul. According to this supposition, which is adopted by Mynster, Credner, and Jowett, there is no difficulty in explaining the inconsistency in different passages of the epistle, which speak as if the Galatians were both Gentiles and Jews; or in accounting for their relapse into Judaism. Jewish teachers, who were there before and after Paul, could easily persuade the converts of the necessity of circumcision. The churches in Galatia consisted mainly of those who had passed through a phase of Judaism. Jews by descent were fewer, while the smallest number consisted of those who turned directly from paganism to Christianity. The habits, prejudices, and education of the converts, made it a difficult task to win them to a pure faith. The outward and sensuous had great attraction for them. Their nature was of the fickle, passionate, enthusiastic type, which passes from one form of religion to another, without laying deep hold on abstract truth. Its magical tendencies were more allied to bodily excision and exercises than to faith alone. A religion of the letter was better adapted to their mental condition, because they were semi-barbarous.

AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the epistle has been admitted by all except Brûno Bauer, who imagines that it was compiled from those to the Romans and Corinthians. The contents and style bear the apostle's stamp.

Lardner and others have found allusions to it in the so-called Apostolic Fathers. Clement of Rome writes: 'Christ our Lord gave his blood for us by the will of God, and his flesh for our flesh, and his spirit for our spirits' (Gal. i. 4).[1] This reference is doubtful. Ignatius says: 'Which bishop, I know, obtained the ministry for the public, not of himself, nor by men, nor out of vain glory, but by the love of God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ (Gal. i. 1).[2] The allusion here is uncertain. Polycarp writes: 'Knowing, then, that "God is not mocked," we ought to walk worthy both of his command,' &c.[3] The epistle to Diognetus speaks of 'the observance of months and days' (Gal. iv. 10).[4]

The *Address to Greeks*, often attributed to Justin Martyr but incorrectly, uses these words: 'Be as I am, for I was as ye are'[5] (Gal. iv. 12). Justin himself has no quotation from it. The most probable evidence of his having regard to it is where he quotes Deut. xxvii. 26, which he introduces, as Paul does, differently from the Greek and Hebrew.[6] Yet it is uncertain whether he made any use of the epistle.

[1] Τὸ αἷμα αὐτοῦ ἔδωκεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, ἐν θελήματι Θεοῦ, καὶ τὴν σάρκα ὑπὲρ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν, καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ψυχῶν ἡμῶν.—*Ad Cor.* cap. 49.

[2] Οὗ ἐπίσκοπον ἔγνων, οὐκ ἀφ' ἑαυτοῦ, οὐδὲ δι' ἀνθρώπων κεκτῆσθαι τὴν διακονίαν, τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ἀνήκουσαν . . . ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγάπῃ Θεοῦ πατρὸς καὶ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.—*Ad Philad.* c. 1.

[3] Εἰδότες οὖν ὅτι Θεὸς οὐ μυκτηρίζεται, ὀφείλομεν ἀξίως τῆς ἐντολῆς κ.τ.λ.—*Ad Philipp.* c. 5.

[4] Bunsen's Analecta Ante-nicaena, vol. i. pp. 110, 111.

[5] γίνεσθε ὡς ἐγώ, ὅτι κἀγὼ ἡμην ὡς ὑμεῖς.—*Orat. ad Graecos*, c. 5.

[6] Dial. cum Tryph. ii. p. 345, ed. Thirlby.

The first express testimony to the authenticity of the epistle, is given by fathers at the close of the second century and the first half of the third, by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian. The first writes: 'The apostle says in the epistle to the Galatians: "Of what use, then, is the law of works? It was added until the seed should come to whom the promise was made,"' &c. (Gal. iii. 19).[1] Clement of Alexandria says: 'Wherefore Paul also, writing to the Galatians, says: "My children, of whom I travail again until,"' &c. (Gal. iv. 19).[2] Tertullian's testimony is to this effect: 'But no more need be said on this head, if it be the same Paul who writing to the Galatians, reckons heresies among the works of the flesh,' &c.[3] The epistle is in the Peshito, the old Latin version, and the Muratorian canon.

The early heretics were also acquainted with the epistle, ascribing it to its true author. It was in Marcion's canon, though he is said to have omitted an important passage (iii. 6–9), and interpolated two words in another (ii. 5). Both charges are false, though Tertullian makes them.

Celsus says, that all the Christian sects, much as they may have hated one another, had perpetually in their mouths the words of Gal. vi. 14, 'The world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world.' The Valentinians wished to prove, by the same passage, that Paul attributed to the cross the virtue which they did.[4] Other testimonies are unnecessary.

The Pauline authorship of the epistle has an important bearing on the Acts of the Apostles. It presents

[1] Sed et in ea quae est ad Galatas sic ait (apostolus): Quid ergo lex factorum? Posita est usque quo veniat semen cui promissum est, &c. —*Adv. Haeres.* iii. 7, p. 210, ed. Grabe.

[2] Διὸ καὶ Παῦλος Γαλάταις ἐπιστέλλων φησί· Τεκνία μου, οὓς πάλιν ὠδίνω, ἄχρις οὗ, κ.τ.λ.—*Stromata*, iii. p. 468, ed. Coln. 1688.

[3] Nec diutius de isto, si idem est Paulus, qui et alibi haereses inter carnalia crimina numerat, scribens ad Galatas, &c.—*De Praescript. Haeret.* c. 6.

[4] Origen contra Celsum, v. 64.

Paul in a different light from the historian's—so different as to cast grave suspicions on the accuracy of the portrait in the Acts. The Paul of the epistle is not the Paul of Luke. The apostle of the Acts is an observer of the law, like Peter, James, and John. He looks upon circumcision leniently, allowing it under the gospel; in the epistle, he opposes it as contrary to the genius of the gospel. It is possible to exaggerate the differences between the history and the epistle, in their portraiture of Paul, and we are not disposed to deny that they have been magnified; but after all reasonable deduction, enough remains to show that he is not the same man in both. There is a general discrepancy, with minor points of agreement—a variation of opinion and feeling, that does injury to the apostle's character. His conceptions of Christianity were clear and decided, when he wrote the group of epistles, comprising those to the Corinthians, Romans, and Galatians; they were hardly the same as he appears in the Acts.

The relation between Paul and the original apostles, is also presented differently in the two works. In the epistle, the antagonism between the apostle of the Gentiles and the twelve, personal and doctrinal, is too palpable to be denied. They are men in the first phase of Christianity—Judaic Christians with narrow conceptions; in the Acts they are more liberal, allowing Gentile Christians exemption from the law of Moses. The relations between them and Paul are not harmonious, which they could not be while the former maintained a modified Judaism. An uncompromising advocate of a free Christianity and the abrogation of the law, had little sympathy with their views. In the Acts there is a better understanding between the parties; and their points of antagonism are softened down.

Apologists, in their efforts to reconcile these differences, have made a few concessions, not important, but significant. They should not, however, attribute a denial

of the divine origin of the gospel to the critics who bring out the distinctive features of the epistle into prominence. Petrine Christianity was the first stage through which the new religion passed after its development out of Judaism; Pauline Christianity was a later, more comprehensive, freer stage, unlike the former. The essential point between them was the observance or non-observance of the law—a principle of antagonism which had to be broken down. The manner in which Paul speaks of Peter, James, and John, in the Galatian epistle, is not cordial but depreciatory: 'Those who seemed to be somewhat (whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me,' &c.). It is a subterfuge to say that this language is not depreciatory of the twelve themselves but of the extravagant claims set up for them by the Judaisers. Does not the apostle speak of a different gospel of the circumcision and uncircumcision (ii. 2, 7); and of an opposition between himself and the twelve (*contrariwise*, verse 7), which, whatever it was, implied at least, that they left him to fight his own battle without help? Great as was their authority, they did not assist him in the least, but continued to preach the gospel of the circumcision to the Jews.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into three parts: i. 1–ii. 21; iii. 1–iv. 20; v. 1–vi. 18. The first is personal and apologetic; the second doctrinal; and the third practical. Each may be subdivided into paragraphs.

1. In maintaining the independent principle on which his apostolic calling rested, Paul states various particulars in his life. He begins with asserting that he was not made an apostle by man but by Jesus Christ and God the Father. He then salutes the churches in Galatia, reproves the fickleness of the converts, expressing astonishment at the sudden change in their belief,

pronounces a strong anathema on any who should preach another gospel, and declares, in opposition to the Judaisers, that his object was not to please men. The gospel he preached was not of human origin nor conformed to human wisdom, but received by immediate revelation. The independence of his apostleship on the elder apostles he shews *negatively*, by stating that he was already an apostle before he came into contact with them. When God revealed his Son in him, he did not consult with any man, nor go up to Jerusalem to learn of the twelve, but went into Arabia and did not visit Jerusalem till after three years; on which occasion he saw none of the apostles except Peter and James, and remained only fifteen days; far too short a time to allow of his being instructed in Christian doctrine if he had been previously ignorant of it. Still further, to prove that he had not been taught Christianity by the chief apostles, he asserts that he was a stranger to the Christians in Judea, who had merely heard of his conversion. The independence of his apostolic authority is also shown *positively* by his conceding nothing to the elder apostles when he came into contact with them, by the assertion of his rights against them, and their recognition. On the occasion of his third journey to Jerusalem, he went thither, in consequence of an express revelation, with Barnabas and Titus. Having explained the gospel he preached, to Peter, James, and John privately, they approved. He did not yield to the demand to circumcise Titus; and got no information from the twelve, who left him to follow his own course without hindrance. The only thing proposed to Paul was, that collections should continue to be made in the churches for the use of the poor Christians in Judea (i.–ii. 10). In continuation of his argument respecting personal and doctrinal independence, it is stated that he reprimanded Peter at Antioch, who through fear of the Judaisers acted so as to betray the

liberty of Gentile converts. The substance of his language to Peter was—that even such as were born Jews believed in Jesus Christ for justification, since with all their attachment to the law, they knew that no man could be justified by works. The believer by means of the law becomes dead to it, that he may begin to live to God. He is crucified with Christ, and his life is a life of faith in the Son of God. The doctrine of justification by faith, so far from annulling the grace of God, establishes its necessity; but if justification be by the law, Christ died in vain (ii. 11–21).

2. The position thus laid down, viz. that it is faith in Christ which justifies, not works of the law, is shown to be a fact of Christian consciousness, and also a truth inherent in the Old Testament, inasmuch as the substance of the old dispensation is the promise made to Abraham; the law being essentially nothing but an appendix to that promise. The apostle appeals with confidence to the Galatians themselves, asking whether they had received the Spirit by the law or the gospel. Beginning in the spirit, were they making an end in the flesh? Abraham himself was justified by faith not by the law; and righteousness belongs to all who by faith are his spiritual children. The law pronounces condemnation on all, because it requires absolute obedience, which none can render. Christ in dying delivered men from the curse of the law, that the blessing promised to Abraham might come upon the Gentiles—the blessing of the promised Spirit (iii. 1–14). The writer proceeds to explain the essence of the law, in which he shows its subordination to the promise, and the relative significance which it has in its intermediate position between the promise and faith. If a human covenant cannot be broken, much less can God's promise made to Abraham and his seed. The law intervening between the promise and its fulfilment, could not prevent the latter. If it be asked, Of what use then is the law?—

the answer is, it was added to convince of sin till the promised seed should come; but it was firmly established by angels not by God himself, and had a mediator. Now a mediator implies two persons, but there is no mediation in God: one is better than two: the dispensation of mediation or the law is inferior to the promise of faith or the gospel. This does not imply that the law is opposed to the gospel; it was rather intended to prepare the way for it. It was a tutor leading men to Christ, that they might be justified by faith. Under the gospel all are the sons of God by faith. There is no distinction between Jew and Greek. All are bound together in spiritual unity (iii. 15–29). Prior to the gospel both Jews and Gentiles were in bondage; but now God has sent his Son to deliver such as were under the dominion of an outward religion, that they might be adopted as sons. As a proof of this He has given them the Spirit of his Son; so that they are no longer in a state of bondage but heirs of God. He reminds the Galatians of their former idolatrous state, and of their present one in which it would be preposterous for them to turn back to the weak and beggarly elements of Judaism (iv. 1–11). A sort of parenthetic or abrupt passage is thrown in here, expressing the painful feelings of the writer, his dejection and anger (iv. 13–20). Speaking of himself, he exhorts them to be of the same mind with him. He is not referring to personal wrongs; they had shown great attachment to him. Weak and sickly as he was, they received him as an angel of God. Was it possible that they could have become enemies, because he told them the truth? The Judaisers desired to make proselytes of them, but their motives were bad, since they wished to shut them out from Christ. He remarks that zealous affection is a good principle in a good cause; a principle which should be continued in his absence as well as presence; expresses his great solicitude about them till they should be spiritually

renewed and restored, and then changes his style. After the fragmentary passage noticed, he reverts to the Old Testament to show them that they did not rightly understand the law, and allegorises the two covenants. Sarah, Abraham's wife, with her son Isaac, represents the New Testament church, which is free; Hagar, the bondwoman, with her son Ishmael, represents the Old Testament church. The latter must give place to the former. Thus the law and the gospel are paralleled with the two children of Abraham (iv. 21–31).

3. The practical part of the epistle begins with the 5th chapter.

The Galatians should remember their freedom under the new economy, and not allow themselves to be entangled again with the yoke of bondage. He warns them against circumcision, declaring that if they submitted to it Christ would be of no avail to them, because the circumcised virtually engage to keep the whole law. Under the gospel circumcision and uncircumcision are alike valueless; nothing but faith working by love avails. The Galatians had made a good beginning; but they were not now what they once were. They had been drawn away by the leaven of false teachers. Still he expresses a hope that they would not abandon themselves to errorists. As for himself, if he preached circumcision, as he had been accused of doing, there could be no reason for the Jews persecuting him. In that case, they had no more to say against him. But the fact that he was still an object of persecution sufficiently attests that he preached Christ's cross. In irony he adds, Would that they who trouble you would make themselves eunuchs, incapable of the privilege of circumcision!

While adhering to the liberty of the gospel, Paul exhorts them not to abuse it. They were bound to love one another, and so to fulfil the law. By leading a life of conformity to the will of God, they would take

the most effectual method to suppress the sensual nature within them, and be released from the law as a system of outward observances. He then enumerates the works of the flesh and the fruit of the Spirit, reminding them that Christ's true disciples have crucified their sinful nature, and walk in the freedom of the divine life. Among various exhortations he recommends generosity to their instructors. Their duty was to do good to all men, especially to fellow-christians.

After saying that he was writing the epistle in large letters with his own hand, his anxiety for the Galatians breaks forth again, and he repeats in brief the substance of the whole. He tells them that the Judaisers, wishing to have some outward privilege to glory in, insisted on having them circumcised, only that they might not be persecuted because of the cross of Christ. They were inconsistent in observing some usages of the law and abandoning others; wishing to glory in Jewish ordinances, while Paul gloried in the cross of Christ. Pronouncing peace on such as walked by the rule of the new creature, he desires in conclusion, that the Galatians should give him no further trouble, since he carried about in his person the marks of sufferings endured for Christ. The letter closes with the usual benediction (v. vi.).

Contrary to usage, the apostle wrote the epistle with his own hand. The characters were large and ill-shaped, for he was a poor penman. The reason of his writing it himself was not to prevent forgery, as Olshausen thinks, but to prove the extent of his affection, because the false teachers had endeavoured to alienate from him the minds of the Galatians.

INTERPRETATION OF PASSAGES, AND GENERAL OBSERVATIONS.

'Tell me, ye that desire to be under the law, do ye not hear the law? For it is written, that Abraham

had two sons, the one by a bondmaid, the other by a freewoman. But he who was of the bondwoman was born after the flesh; but he of the freewoman was by promise. Which things are an allegory: for these are the two covenants; the one from the mount Sinai, which gendereth to bondage, which is Agar. For this Agar is mount Sinai in Arabia, and answereth to Jerusalem which now is, and is in bondage with her children. But Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all. For it is written, Rejoice, thou barren, that bearest not; break forth and cry, thou that travailest not: for the desolate hath many more children than she which hath an husband.'—iv. 21–27.

This passage has an important bearing on the hermeneutics of the apostle Paul. That he sometimes adopted the rabbinical mode of interpretation is not questioned, in the face of various parts of his epistles. He allegorises the Old Testament history, as the Jews of his time were wont to do. What is meant by *allegorising* it? The following remarks will suffice for answer.

1. Bishop Marsh argues[1] that Paul does not pronounce the history itself an allegory, but merely declares it *allegorised*. It is one thing to say that a history is allegorised; it is another to say that it is allegory itself. Had the apostle meant that the history was an allegory, he need not have allegorised it. Paul *treats* the portion of history as an allegory, but does not thereby *convert* it into an allegory. He institutes the same comparison which we institute in an allegory; but the subjects of the comparison do not acquire the same character with the subjects of an allegory. This reasoning is followed by Palfrey, who bluntly says that the rendering, 'which things are an allegory,' 'represents Paul as saying precisely what he did not mean to

[1] Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible, p. 354, *et seq.* ed. 1828.

say.'[1] The argument is ingenious but null, the common rendering being as good as the proposed one. There is no real difference between the two versions; nor did the apostle make linguistic distinctions, as suggested. He had not 'infidels' in view, as the worthy bishop had; and was not therefore obliged to tax his ingenuity.

2. Scripture history may be interpreted allegorically in two ways. It may be used typically, in which case the historical sense is preserved; or it may be employed in the genuine allegorical sense, excluding every other. Tholuck[2] argues that the apostle has applied a typical sense here, preserving the historical one. It is of little importance whether *allegorised* means *applied as types*, or not; the real question is, Was the typical or allegorical sense intended by the writers of the Old Testament themselves? A typical sense may be as fanciful as an allegorical one. It is an axiom of interpretation, that no passage has more than one sense. If so, the typical sense is an imaginary one—a mere application of history to something which the original writer did not think of. The apostle has given a spiritual or mystical meaning to the narrative of Abraham and his two sons, agreeably to the Jewish mode of allegorising. As a specimen of interpretation, it is fanciful and incorrect; but it suited his purpose and readers. Ishmael had nothing to do with the law, and his being brought here into connection with it, as well as Isaac, shows arbitrariness. Objective and subjective were equally real to the mind of the apostle, and of the same value. He was not careful to distinguish them, nor to avoid the typical even where it was far-fetched.

In making these remarks, we do not deny that deeper meanings may lie hid under the Old Testament history, still less that Paul may be right, though the Jews were wrong, in allegorising. All that is asserted is, that *the*

[1] The Relation between Judaism and Christianity, p. 287.
[2] Das alte Testament im neuen Testament, p. 37, *et seq.*

present passage exhibits an arbitrary example of the typical sense. Into the wide question whether the Old Testament dispensation was a system of typical events and ordinances, we do not enter. Whatever answer be given to it, one thing is not denied by impartial critics, that fanciful interpretations of the Old Testament are met with in the New; that senses never meant by the original writers are educed; and that the true historical meaning is occasionally misapprehended, or excluded by another. In such instances, it is not necessary to affirm that the writers give unauthoritative senses; their interpretations have all the authority inherent in the spiritual knowledge and discernment of individuals whose wide inspiration may be put in the balance against severe logic.

Apologists try to blunt the edge of these facts in their bearing on the nature of the writer's inspiration by saying, that allegorical interpretations are used as *illustrations* rather than arguments; forgetting that with Paul, there is no difference between the two; and that *the mode* of his teaching, not the substance, is affected, as if mode and substance were not inseparably connected. It is idle to descant on the supposed dogmatism which is said to set up the intellectual standard of our age as an infallible rule; because we measure the logic of the apostle by acknowledged axioms of interpretation. Philosophy and exegesis are capable of judging allegory rightly, without arrogating infallibility; and it is only the men who maintain a plenary inspiration for the sacred authors—an infallibility which those authors themselves never claim—that conceal their imperfect reasonings by aspersing modern criticism.

Our observations will be confirmed by another passage in the epistle (iii. 16), which runs thus:—

'Now to Abraham and his seed were the promises made. He saith not, And to seeds, as of many; but as of one, And to thy seed, which is Christ.'

After saying that the promise was made to Abraham and his seed, an explanatory gloss is subjoined to strengthen the argument. Paul states that the words of the Old Testament were, 'to thy seed,' limiting the noun to one person, i.e. Christ, by using the singular not the plural number. The reasoning turns on the number of the noun, from which it has been concluded that the apostle believed in the verbal inspiration of the Old Testament. The plural of the Hebrew word, here rendered by a corresponding Greek one, could not have been used, because it only means 'crops of grain.' Hence it is superfluous to say that he did not employ the plural. Besides, the Hebrew word *seed*, and its Greek representative[1] are collective in the singular, denoting *posterity*; whereas *seed* is limited by the apostle to one person, i.e. Christ, a collective sense disappearing. Here we have a rabbinical exposition. The Jews sometimes pressed the singular or plural in this fashion; and explained *the seed* in Genesis of Messiah. The error, though a grammatical one, affects the theological interpretation. The seed of Abraham certainly meant nothing else but the Jewish people; and to give it another sense is contrary to exegesis. There is no secondary or typical sense apart from the historical one. If such be assumed, it is independent of and opposed to the latter; resting on an imaginary basis only. If it be evolved out of the latter, it is only by a spiritualising process that goes to supersede that which gives it birth. Allegorical interpretation sets aside the legitimate sense. So in the present instance, where *the seed of Abraham* assumes a meaning which has no authority except in the rabbinical education of the apostle. If any wish to see the efforts of an overstrained anxiety to defend this apostolic *midrash*, he has only to read Tholuck's remarks. Apologists fall into the most palpable blun-

[1] σπέρμα, זֶרַע.

ders in upholding the accuracy of a rabbinical comment, absurdly asserting that his argument is independent of his philology, when the argument *turns upon* the philology, since the author infers that Christ alone is meant, because the singular number of the noun *seed* is used. Grammar and philology control exposition. Theological, resolves itself into grammatical, interpretation.

The points of resemblance and difference between the epistles to the Galatians and Romans are admirably drawn out by Jowett. Both set forth the doctrine of justification by faith, the universality of the gospel, which makes no distinction between Jew or Greek, bond or free; the nature of sin as a transgression of the law; the spiritual union of the believer with Christ; they mention the observance of days and months, which is treated in the one as indifferent, in the other as hurtful; contain exhortations against antinomianism; the sonship of the gospel contrasted with the bondage of the Jewish economy; and a summary of works of the flesh. The differences are these. The epistle to the Galatians is personal and occasional; that to the Romans is more like a treatise than a letter. The one treats circumcision as a question of practice, the other of the law as a burden on the heart and conscience. The argument of the one is partial and fragmentary; that of the other comprehensive and continuous, extending over all mankind and all time. The epistle to the Galatians is an argument or expostulation with Judaising opponents; that to the Romans is an argument or dialogue with self, in which the opponent is only a shadow or idea, 'the old man' of the apostle's own thoughts, not the Jewish Christian with whom he is in actual conflict.

It is scarcely necessary to remark, that the term *law* as used in the epistles has a comprehensive sense, and should not be restricted to the ceremonial law. It embraces the moral and ceremonial. Both indeed are united, being but different forms of law, a finer and a

grosser. The one or the other is prominent according to the context, and were evidently undistinguished in the apostle's thoughts. He excludes every form of law from an inherent efficacy to impart salvation, whether in the shape of ceremonial observances or deeds of sanctity or refined morality. Salvation is by faith in Christ, not by works of the law. Faith justifies, not faith in One who fulfilled the law *in our stead*, or *satisfied divine justice*, but in One who mirrored in Himself the Father's love to humanity, introduced a religion of the spirit and of freedom, and gave that marvellous proof of self-sacrifice which becomes the attractive power of the soul—its mainspring and life.

The mode in which St. Paul expounds the way of salvation, was largely shaped by the attitude in which he stood to the Judaisers—those persevering adversaries that waged incessant war against his free Christianity. If they insisted on the obligation of the law, he had to bring into prominence the efficacy of faith irrespective of law. If they urged the doing of things enjoined in the law, he had to confront it with a subjective principle opposed to external performances. Writers who did not occupy the same position of antagonism to Judaism, naturally spoke of salvation in a different way. James says that a man is justified by works. The general spirit of Christ's teaching is that we are justified by love. Paul himself states that we are justified by grace, and by the blood of Christ. All these expressions contain the same idea; as does that other, 'saved by hope;' for justification is nothing else than *salvation*, the resurrection of the soul to a new life; its right direction and elevation. Theologians, as usual, have drawn their distinctions about justification; going beyond Paul in affirming that man is justified by faith *only*, and contradicting James who says that he is *not* justified by faith only; but their logic darkens doctrine and transfers religion to the uncongenial region of me-

taphysics. In justification, they say, the righteousness of Christ is imputed to the believer—a proposition which has no intelligible sense. In justification man becomes just and holy, that is, is raised up to a new life, because he believes that God is his loving Father in Christ Jesus, and acts accordingly. Works cannot be separated from faith; they lie in it necessarily. Indeed faith itself is in one sense a work—a voluntary act or exercise of the soul belonging to man himself. Salvation is of grace; yet man works out his salvation. In other words, God loves his creatures, and has made provision for their redemption after his own purpose; man believes this, and shows true love to God by acting agreeably to His will. There are many degrees of faith and love, that is, men are in a saved or justified state, variously. To draw a line between the saved and not saved is impossible. The degree of faith necessary to justification is indeterminate. In fact the classes of saved and not saved run into one another; so that God alone, whose judgments are pervaded by perfect love and justice, can distinguish them. An unfeeling coarseness in the religious world is pleased to draw dark lines of separation.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1864; Jowett, 1859; Meyer, 1862; Wieseler, 1859; Winer, 1829; Schott, 1834; Hilgenfeld, 1852; Lightfoot, 1866; Jatho, 1856; and Ewald, 1857.

THE EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS.

ORIGIN OF THE CHURCH AT ROME.

THE MANNER and time in which the seed of the gospel was carried to Rome are unknown. That it had taken root there during the life of Christ is an idea which cannot be entertained, though sanctioned by the Clementine homilies. The Jewish population of the city was considerable in the time of the apostles; as we learn from Philo, Josephus, Dio Cassius, and others. When Pompey the Great conquered Judea, he sent large numbers of the inhabitants as prisoners to Rome to be sold for slaves. Under Augustus, the friend of Herod the Great, many of them were liberated and made Roman citizens, having a dwelling-place assigned them beyond the Tiber. The young colony rapidly increased under the fostering influence of the emperor; for Josephus states that more than 8,000 belonging to Rome joined an embassy of fifty deputies from Judea to second a petition to Augustus.[1] But they did not enjoy constant favour, since Sejanus had 4,000 transported to Sardinia, while the remainder were ordered to depart from Italy on a certain day, unless they previously renounced their religion.[2] With the fall of Sejanus the edict lost its significance; and Tiberius's favour returned to the Jews. In like manner Claudius banished them from Rome, A.D. 49 or 50; but many

[1] Antiq. XVII. ii. 1.

[2] Tacit. *Annal.* ii. 85.

must have returned soon after. Dio Cassius testifies that Judaism continued to increase at Rome, in spite of all the restrictions and decrees issued against it.[1]

Were there Christians at Rome when Claudius's decree against the Jews was issued? This point cannot be determined for want of definite historical testimony. A passage in Suetonius bears upon it; but the language is ambiguous. The emperor, it is said, 'banished the Jews from Rome, who were continually raising tumults, at the instigation of Chrestus.'[2] If these words refer to disputes between Jews and Christians, Christianity had already found its way into the Roman synagogue. The Romans mispronounced the name *Christus*, taking it to be the same as *Chrestus*, a Greek word; and therefore Suetonius may have vaguely meant Jesus Christ. It is likely that the words of the Roman historian involve the existence of Christians at Rome in the time of Claudius. The preaching of Christ in the Roman synagogues was a constant source of disturbance, which led to the banishment of the Jews from the city.

A passage in the Acts respecting Aquila and Priscilla is also indefinite in its bearing on the point. 'And found a certain Jew named Aquila, born in Pontus, lately come from Italy, with his wife Priscilla (because that Claudius had commanded all Jews to depart from Rome), and came unto them' (xviii. 2). Some may suppose that Aquila was still a Jew, because he is so called, without a word to indicate his faith in Christianity. But Jewish Christians are so styled in Acts xxi. 39; xxii. 3. Nothing prevents the supposition that Aquila is called a Jew even after he had embraced Christianity, in order to distinguish his nation. If Aquila and Priscilla were already Christians, we can naturally explain why Paul so soon attached himself

[1] Histor. xxxvii. 17. [2] Claud. chap. xxv.

to them. Similarity in faith as well as in occupation, drew him to their abode, rather than to that of other tent-makers at Corinth. It is possible that he may have become a convert after leaving Rome, and before arriving at Corinth, but it is not probable; and if he first made a profession of Christianity at the latter city, his altered sentiments were the result of Paul's teaching. On the whole, it is probable that Aquila and Priscilla were Christians before leaving Rome; though the language of Acts xviii. 2 is not decisive for or against it. The fact of their Christianity before Claudius's decree is not inconsistent with its being directed against the Jews, because the Romans could not distinguish between Jews and Jewish Christians; and their laws made no separation between Judaism and Christianity. We agree with those who assume the existence of Christians at Rome when Claudius's edict was issued; and reckon Aquila with his wife among the number. How long they were such before Claudius, cannot be known. It has been conjectured that Jews from Rome who were present at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, returned home with the seed of the new religion (Acts ii. 10); and that Jewish Christians, scattered abroad by the persecution arising after Stephen's death, may have found their way to the metropolis. The extraordinary influx of foreigners from all parts of the empire furnishes ground for believing that the gospel took early root in the imperial city. The constant intercourse maintained between it and the provinces might create an acquaintance on the part of many with the new religion, whose converts became so numerous.

The Roman Catholic Church has often asserted that Peter was the founder and first bishop of the Christian community at Rome. The earliest document in which this opinion appears is the Clementines, composed at Rome towards the close of the second century in

the interest of Petrine, against Pauline, Christianity. Clement of Alexandria says, that the apostle Peter came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, to confront Simon Magus;[1] with which agrees Eusebius's statement that he was the first president of the church at Rome till his death.[2] Jerome also relates that he governed the Roman church twenty-five years.[3]

According to Dionysius of Corinth in his epistle to the Corinthians, as Eusebius records, Peter and Paul were associated in founding the Roman church;[4] which agrees with Irenaeus's testimony.[5] These patristic statements have no historic credibility, and are refuted by the New Testament itself; for —

(*a*). Peter was still at Jerusalem when the apostolic council was held there, about the twelfth year of Claudius's reign.

(*b*). In speaking of Paul's coming to Rome, the writer of the Acts never alludes to Peter, nor intimates that the church had such a head or founder. *The brethren* met him, and he spent two years with them. Is not this silence unfavourable to the opinion either that Peter had been there, or was there at the time?

(*c*). The epistles written by Paul during his imprisonment make no allusion to Peter. Neither does the latter send any salutation to the readers of those epistles. On the contrary, Aristarchus, Marcus, and Justus are declared to be Paul's only fellow-workers in the kingdom of God (Coloss. iv. 11). Epaphras, Luke, and the saints of Caesar's household are also mentioned. It is impossible that Luke could have been overlooked in the epistles, if he was at Rome when they were written, especially as the salutations of inferior persons

[1] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* ii. 14.
[2] Chron. Lib. ii.—*Opp.* vol. i. p. 539, ed. Migne.
[3] De Script. Eccles. c. i.
[4] H. E. ii. 25.
[5] Ap. Euseb. *H. E.* v. 8.

are noticed; and it is most improbable that he had been there before, since there is no hint of previous residence.

(*d*). Had the Roman believers enjoyed the teaching or episcopal superintendence of Peter, Paul who declares in this very epistle that he had striven to preach the gospel where it had not been heard before lest he should build on another's foundation, would not have been anxious to visit and instruct them.

(*e*). The epistle contains no salutation to Peter, and therefore he was not at Rome when it was written.

These considerations disprove the ancient tradition that Peter was at Rome either in Claudius's reign, or before the writing of the letter. Whether he was ever there is another question, having no necessary connection with his alleged supremacy over the church.

Learned members of the Roman Catholic Church have not adopted the tradition in question. Feilmoser concludes that Peter could not have been in the imperial city sooner than a year before his death.[1]

It follows from these remarks, that Christianity was introduced into Rome as early at least as the middle of the first century, and that the original adherents of it were Jewish Christians. The name of Jesus was first heard in the synagogue. The Church of Rome at its commencement was a Jewish-christian one. It was customary for the primitive teachers of Christianity to address Jews in the first instance. And heathenism had ceased to satisfy reflecting pagans, who longed for a purer worship. Hence many had turned to the Jewish religion, so that according to Seneca in a fragment preserved by Augustine,[2] the conquered gave laws to the conquerors. Juvenal too in his fourteenth satire, ridicules the Jew-loving Romans. Proselytes of the gate, in addition to those who were Hebrews by

[1] Einleitung, p. 106, *et seq.*

[2] De Civitate Dei, lib. vii. c. 11.

descent, formed a constituent part of the early Roman church.

COMPOSITION OF THE CHURCH WHEN THE APOSTLE WROTE.

Few hesitate to admit that the commencement of the church was Jewish-christian. But during the eight or nine years of its existence till Paul's letter was written, a great change may have passed over it. Gentiles may have associated themselves with it in such numbers as to exceed the primitive class and give it another character. Converts to the new religion from Gentilism may have changed the prevailing type into a Gentile-christian one. It is assumed that the edict of Claudius had the effect of separating the Roman Christians as much as possible from all connection with the unbelieving synagogue, in order to escape the consequences of it. But this and similar assumptions in relation to the decree of the Emperor are precarious. It is improbable that all the Jewish Christians were expelled along with every Jew in Rome, leaving the church there to consist of converts from heathenism only. The mildness and humanity of Nero in the first five years of his reign would allow the mass of the expelled to return and resume their place in the community as Christians. But all reasoning about the changed relations of the Roman church in the interval between its founding and the receipt of the apostle's letter has no proper basis. The relative proportion of Jewish and Gentile converts cannot be settled in that way, but by the epistle itself.

The constitution of the church is a subject still in debate. Great critics are found on both sides of the question. The more usual opinion is, that the Gentile element preponderated at the time the epistle was written. Added Gentiles exceeded the Jewish Christians in number. The church seems to have been large when

the apostle wrote. He says, at least, that their faith was spoken of throughout the whole world. It is not necessary to assign a reason for the apostle omitting to mention elders and deacons. Perhaps these officers were not then among them; or the writer's want of knowledge may account for his silence. We cannot tell whether there was a regularly organised church; whether the believers met in one place; or whether they consisted of two or more congregations, usually assembling in separate localities. It is probable, however, that there was no definite organisation; and that the believers met in different places; in the house of Aquila and elsewhere. Whatever unity of belief and feeling existed among them, their outward organisation showed little compactness. The term *church* is not applied to them, nor are *bishops and deacons* spoken of, as in the Philippian epistle. But it is unsafe to argue from the absence of these expressions, respecting the existence or non-existence of a *formal church*. Nor can xiii. 11 be built upon in relation to the point, though Ewald seems to do so. Whatever may have been their external arrangements, the mutual spirit of the believers was not a model of love, if Jewish and Gentile Christians formed distinct portions of the one community; for the narrowness of the one prevented cordial sympathy with the other.

How far the apostle was aware of their exact state is a question that cannot be answered. He had doubtless received accounts of it from converts who visited him in Greece and elsewhere; but his knowledge must have been general, unless there was frequent intercourse between him and Christians in the metropolis.

No light can be thrown upon the state of the church at Rome when the apostle wrote, by the conclusion of the Acts where his personal arrival in the city is mentioned, because that narrative is unhistorical. How could the leaders of the Jews be so ignorant of Chris-

tianity, when a numerous church existed near them with many Jewish converts belonging to it? The community was not so insignificant as to elude their observation or excite their contempt. The Jews and Christians of the metropolis were too much identified in opposition to heathenism not to know one another; however antagonistic they may have been mutually. The epistle itself affords the only means of ascertaining the actual composition of the community, whether it was more Jewish or Gentile. That the mass of believers consisted of Gentile Christians has been inferred from several passages, chiefly the following.

'By whom we have received grace and apostleship for obedience to the faith among *all nations* for his name, *among whom* are ye also the called of Jesus Christ' (i. 5, 6). Here the word rendered *nations* means Gentiles generally; and though it might be said of born Jews that they lived among the heathen at Rome, it is more agreeable to the language of the apostle to understand him as saying that his readers were a part of the heathen to whom his apostleship referred.

'Now I would not have you ignorant, brethren, that oftentimes I purposed to come unto you (but was let hitherto), that I might have some fruit among you also, *even as among other Gentiles*' (i. 13). These words are more exact than the last in affirming that the community was a Gentile one, composed of converts from heathenism. Mangold errs in confining the fruit which Paul wished to gather among them to the converting of Gentiles in Rome;[1] it refers to activity among Roman Christians already converted.

A third place, on which Tholuck[2] lays considerable stress, is in the 15th chapter. 'Nevertheless, brethren,

[1] Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der römischen Gemeinde, p. 82.
[2] Commentar zum Briefe Pauli an die Römer, Einleit. § 2.

I have written the more boldly unto you, in some sort as putting you in mind, because of the grace that is given to me of God, that I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the gospel of God, that the offering up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost' (xv. 15, 16). Here Paul announces himself the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, that the offering of the Gentiles might be acceptable to God. But the context does not necessarily limit the *offering of the Gentiles* to that of the *Roman Christians*, as is assumed.

Other places, such as xi. 13, 17–24, 28, 30, where the writer turns to the Gentiles among the Roman Christians, are consistent with the assumption that the majority of the church was Jewish. Indeed the words of xi. 13, 'I speak to you Gentiles,' imply that they were a minority. The reasoning of the apostle throughout the epistle implies Jewish readers acquainted with the law. This is conspicuous in chaps. ix.–xi., in ii.–iv., and elsewhere. The general argument is unintelligible or at least irrelevant, without its implied relation to Jewish modes of thought. How then are we to reconcile the two conflicting phenomena? How bring together the plain statements in i. 13, where the Roman Christians are called *Gentiles*, and in vii. 1, where the writer speaks to them 'that know the law'? The explanation that the apostle turns to one class in the church in some parts of the epistle, and in other parts to another class, does not meet the case. If we suppose with most critics, that the great majority of the church were Gentile Christians, the opinion does not harmonise with the general tone of the letter, or the knowledge of the law presupposed in the readers, unless those Gentile Christians were Jewish proselytes. And the testimony of a few passages is too plain to allow of the opinion that the church was for the most part Jewish-christian, unless that prevailing element in

it consisted of native Jewish Christians and Jewish converts of Gentile extraction. Here is the solution of the difficulty proposed by Prof. Jowett. 'The Roman church appeared to be at once Jewish and Gentile; Jewish in feeling, Gentile in origin. Jewish, because the apostle everywhere argues with them as Jews; Gentile, because he expressly addresses them by name as such.'[1] The majority were Gentiles; but so many of them had learned Judaism that they, together with the influential Jewish-christian minority, constituted the body of the church. The only point for which Mr. Jowett does not seem to make due allowance is the substantial Jewish centre of the church, to which a Gentile growth was added. The mass were Jewish Christians, including such as were Jews and Gentiles by birth; but because the Gentile converts had passed through Judaism into Christianity, their feelings and tendencies were of the Jewish type. It cannot be denied, however, that a portion of the church consisted of Gentile converts, who passed at once from paganism to Christianity, for two parties in the church are hinted at in some parts of the letter, between whom there was always a degree of jealousy. The seeds of dissension lay in their doctrinal views. The Jew, after embracing Christianity, was still attached to the Mosaic law, valuing it too highly to be renounced at once. He sought salvation through Christ in connection with the rites he had been nurtured in. The Gentile Christian, despising Jewish partiality to outward forms, presumed, in his sense of freedom, to do things liable to offend the conscience of his less enlightened brother. Thus there was a constant tendency to variance between the parties. The elements of strife appeared in the Roman church when Paul wrote his epistle, but were less visible and marked than in the Galatian congregations. Various allusions in the closing

[1] St. Paul's Epistles to the Thessalonians, Galatians, Romans, &c., vol. ii. p. 23, 2nd ed.

chapters imply the existence of Judaic prejudices. The admonitions addressed to the weak and the strong in the 14th chapter refer to Jewish and Gentile Christians respectively. To what extent alienation between them had proceeded it is difficult to tell; but they had produced no rupture. The parties were not strongly arrayed against one another. The pretensions of the Jewish Christians do not seem to have been arrogant against their Gentile brethren; but though no breach had been effected, the one had deep-rooted scruples about the admission of the Gentiles to the full privileges of God's people. The question of circumcision had not separated them; and they were not of one mind as to meats, days, and the like peculiarities. Still there was the Jewish tendency on one hand, and the free spirit on the other; the former the more prominent and stronger. The apostle himself knew its stubbornness, for it affected his authority, and thwarted the genius of the gospel he preached. But he could treat it tenderly as well as firmly, because his love for his countrymen was strong within him, frequently bursting forth in the midst of anti-Judaic reasonings, and tempering them with mildness. We see a constant conflict between his convictions and feelings: the former too deep to be changed, the latter too strong to be repressed, too ardent to be quenched by opposition of the persons he loved.

THE APOSTLE'S OBJECT OR DESIGN IN WRITING.

The object of Paul in the present epistle may be represented in so general a light as either to exclude all references to the special relations of the church addressed; or to reduce their intrinsic value to comparative insignificance. This has been done by such critics as Olshausen, who suppose that the writer intended to set forth the essential truths of the gospel in their

adaptation to sinful humanity—to expound the plan of salvation as conferring equal blessings on all. According to the view in question, the cardinal doctrines of Christianity are inculcated in substance, and the apostle's design was didactic. Simple but comprehensive, that design filled his soul, giving rise to an epistle of ampler range and profounder views than any other apostolic communication—to a doctrinal treatise rather than a letter. This view of the epistle is maintained by many good critics, including De Wette and Reiche. But though the ground taken by the writer is general like his commission, there is reason for doubting the correctness of the opinion. In all other instances, the epistles arose out of certain circumstances in the state of the parties addressed, and the connection between them and the writer. Nor should the present be made an exception, especially as the letter itself is not uncoloured by the condition and feelings of those to whom it is directed. Analogy is against a general didactic object. The letter was suggested by the relations of the Roman community itself. It originated in the circumstances of the church; and refers to the members of it more or less definitely. An object so general as that of an exposition of the gospel to the Roman converts, savours of modern theology, rather than of the first century in which Christianity was not only apprehended very differently by different parties, especially by Jewish and Gentile Christians, but taught by apostles in a wider or narrower, a more liberal or more sectarian form, according to educational prepossessions or mental tendencies. Christian truth did not lie in the minds of the apostles as a complete whole which they had only to set forth in its absolute relations. It was progressively developed within them, becoming clearer and more comprehensive to their consciousness according to subjective and objective conditions. They were men of a peculiar age, one characterised by rapid changes and revolutionary

ideas. They were in the midst of moving events; extraordinary impulses without, and a divine spirit remarkably active, within. Hence they could not like us moderns, give forth a wide scheme of doctrine, the result of calm reflection, as a perfect or complete synopsis for the future as well as the present. Their ideas were shaped by prevalent currents of thought, and came with the limitations which local and temporary exigencies necessarily create.

The object of the apostle must have been more definite. Baur makes it polemic. Believing that the Jewish Christians formed the chief part of the Roman church and that an antipauline tendency had begun to develop itself early among them, he supposes that they took offence at the ministry of Paul because they saw it effective in bringing constantly increasing numbers into the kingdom of Messiah, while Israel as a nation was excluded. They made objections, therefore, to the apostle's universalism. As long as the nation of Israel did not participate in the grace of the gospel, they regarded the reception of the Gentiles as an abridgment of their prerogatives—an injustice done to them—a barrier to the promises given to Jehovah's people. Asserting that Christian salvation has only a particular bearing, they thought that the bestowment of grace depended on national privileges. The epistle was written to meet this state of feeling in the church; and is therefore a justification of Paul's apostleship, called forth by Jewish antagonism. No friendly circumstances gave rise to it. It grew out of unfavourable views in a church where the Gentile Christians were nothing compared with the Jewish believers. Hence the tone is polemic or at least apologetic.[1]

Agreeably to this hypothesis, Baur regards chapters ix.–xi. as the centre and nucleus of the entire epistle—the essential portion which gave occasion to the whole.

[1] Paulus, der Apostel Jesu Christi, p. 341, *et seq.*

Although the opinion in question comes near the true view of the writer's object, it is hardly correct. It implies too wide a feeling of separation between the Jewish and Gentile Christians in the Roman church; and pushes the influence as well as the pretensions of the former to excess by reducing the latter to an insignificant minimum. It also overlooks some of the apostle's own declarations, especially those in the introduction to the letter (i. 1–17); and undervalues the first eight chapters.

We cannot accept the view, either as the critic sets it forth, or in the modified form which Mangold gives it.[1] The occasion of writing was the particular state of the church at Rome. There are special injunctions not suggested by the *possibility* of disturbing influences within the church, nor by what the apostle had encountered in Galatia and Corinth, but by existing facts. But the tendency and tone are general, because the apostle's design was to explain and justify the gospel of universalism which he preached to the heathen, rather than his own apostleship. By this means he met the scruples of the Jewish Christians respecting the admission of the Gentiles to the same privileges with the Jews, and showed the inability of the law to bestow a righteousness attainable through faith alone. The occasion was special; but the object is general. Hence the letter is not a compendium of evangelical doctrine, or a Pauline system of dogmatic theology. Neither is it a general summary of what he had written before, or a combination of the fragmentary teaching contained in other letters. His tone is expository, and indirectly polemic. The views of the Jewish Christians who formed the body of the church, their theocratic scruples respecting the Gentiles, their national prepossessions, are effectually combated, not by direct antagonism or

[1] Der Römerbrief und die Anfänge der Römischen Gemeinde, 1866.

personal argument, but in the copious exposition and defence of the truth which he preached to the Gentiles as their peculiar apostle. Such procedure would further the spiritual life of the Christian body at Rome, and unite the two parties in a common faith.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

When the apostle wrote, he was about to go to Jerusalem to minister to the saints, with contributions from Macedonia and Achaia (xv. 25–27), which indicates his last abode in Achaia of three months' duration (Acts xx. 3). He intended to pass from Achaia to Syria, in order to get to Jerusalem directly; but was compelled by the machinations of the Jews to take another way, back through Macedonia. This alteration of plan had not been made when he wrote, else he would have noticed it. We infer, therefore, that the epistle was composed before he set out again from Achaia. Corinth was the chief city; and we may fix upon it as the place of his three months' stay. That it was written there may be inferred from the fact, that Caius, an inhabitant of Corinth, sends a salutation to the Roman Christians. Erastus is also mentioned as steward of the city where the apostle wrote; and we learn from 2 Tim. iv. 20, that he dwelt at Corinth. Phoebe, a deaconess of the church at Cenchrea, is also commended to the Romans; and Cenchrea was the port of Corinth. From the manner in which she is introduced to the favourable regard of the Roman Christians it is conjectured that she was the bearer of the letter, either alone or with others. It should be remembered, however, that these indications of time and place are drawn from the 16th chapter, the authenticity of which is questionable. Hence the epistle was written A.D. 58.

AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity of the epistle has been called in question by Evanson and Bruno Bauer, though it is amply attested, both by the most ancient witnesses and internal considerations.

Clement of Rome writes: 'Casting off from us all unrighteousness and iniquity, covetousness, debates, malignities and deceits, whisperings and backbitings, hatred of God, pride and boasting, vain glory and ambition. For they that do such things are hateful to God; and not only they that do them, but they also who have pleasure in them.' (Compare Rom. i. 29–32).[1] Compare also Rom. iii. 29 with ch. xxx.; xii. 5 with ch. xlvi.; xiv. i. with ch. xxxviii.

Polycarp has the following: 'And must all stand before the judgment-seat of Christ, and every one give an account for himself' (Rom. xiv. 10).[2]

Theophilus of Antioch (180) says: 'To them who by patient continuance in well-doing seek for immortality, He will give eternal life, joy, peace, rest, and many good things, &c. . . . But to the unbelieving and the despisers, and them that obey not the truth, but obey unrighteousness . . . . shall be wrath and indignation, tribulation and anguish' (compare Rom. ii. 6–9).[3] In another place, 'Honour to whom honour, fear to whom

[1] Ἀπορρίψαντες ἀφ' ἑαυτῶν πᾶσαν ἀδικίαν καὶ ἀνομίαν, πλεονεξίαν, ἔρεις, κακοηθείας τε καὶ δόλους, ψιθυρισμούς τε καὶ καταλαλιάς, θεοστυγίαν, ὑπερηφανίαν τε καὶ ἀλαζονείαν, κενοδοξίαν τε καὶ ἀφιλοξενίαν. Ταῦτα γὰρ οἱ πράσσοντες στυγητοὶ τῷ Θεῷ ὑπάρχουσιν· οὐ μόνον δὲ οἱ πράσσοντες αὐτά, ἀλλὰ καὶ οἱ συνευδοκοῦντες αὐτοῖς.—1 *Ep. ad Cor.* c. xxxv. pp. 49, 50, ed. Hefele, 1842.

[2] Πάντας δεῖ παραστῆναι τῷ βήματι τοῦ Χριστοῦ, καὶ ἕκαστον ὑπὲρ ἑαυτοῦ λόγον δοῦναι.—*Ad Philipp.* c. 6.

[3] Τοῖς μὲν καθ' ὑπομονὴν διὰ ἔργων ἀγαθῶν ζητοῦσι τὴν ἀφθαρσίαν, δωρήσεται ζωὴν αἰώνιον, χαράν, εἰρήνην, ἀνάπαυσιν, καὶ πλήθη ἀγαθῶν . . . τοῖς δὲ ἀπίστοις καὶ καταφρονηταῖς, καὶ ἀπειθοῦσι τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, πειθομένοις δὲ τῇ ἀδικίᾳ, . . . ἔσται ὀργὴ καὶ θυμός, θλῖψις καὶ στενοχωρίαι.—*Ad Autolyc.* lib. ii. p. 79, ed. Colon.

fear, tribute to whom tribute; to owe no man anything, but only to love all men' (Rom. xiii. 7, 8).[1]

In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons (180), occurs the following quotation: 'Showing indeed that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us' (Rom. viii. 18).[2]

Irenaeus is the first who expressly quotes the epistle as Paul's: 'This same thing Paul has explained, writing to the Romans; Paul, an apostle of Jesus Christ, predestinated to the gospel of God, which He promised by his prophets, &c. And again writing to the Romans he says of Israel, "Whose are the fathers, and of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is God over all, blessed for evermore."'[3]

Clement of Alexandria says: 'Behold therefore, says Paul, the goodness and severity of God,' &c.[4] And in another place: 'In like manner Paul writes in the epistle to the Romans: "How shall we who have died to sin, live any longer in it?"'[5]

Tertullian says: 'But I will call Christ alone God, as the same apostle (Paul) does: of whom Christ came; who is, says he, God over all, blessed for ever.'[6]

[1] *τῷ τὴν τιμήν, τὴν τιμήν· τῷ τὸν φύβον, τὸν φύβον· τῷ τὸν φόρον, τὸν φόρον· μηδενὶ μηδὲν ὀφείλειν ἢ μόνον τὸ ἀγαπᾶν πάντας.—Ad Autolyc.* lib. iii. p. 126.

[2] *ὄντως ἐπιδεικνύμενοι, ὅτι οὐκ ἄξια τὰ παθήματα τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ, πρὸς τὴν μέλλουσαν δόξαν ἀποκαλυφθῆναι εἰς ἡμᾶς.—H. E.* v. i. p. 7, ed. Heinichen.

[3] 'Hoc ipsum interpretatus est Paulus scribens ad Romanos: Paulus apostolus Jesu Christi, praedestinatus ad evangelium Dei, quod promisit per prophetas suos, etc. Et iterum ad Romanos scribens de Israël dicit, quorum patres, et ex quibus Christus secundum carnem, qui est Deus super omnes benedictus in secula.'—*Adv. Haeres.* iii. 18, p. 239, ed. Grabe.

[4] *ἴδε οὖν, φησὶν ὁ Παῦλος, χρηστότητα καὶ ἀποτομίαν Θεοῦ· ἐπὶ μὲν τοὺς πεσόντας, κ.τ.λ.—Paedagog.* lib. i. p. 140, vol. i. ed. Potter.

[5] *ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ῥωμαίους ἐπιστολῇ γράφει· οἵτινες ἀπεθάνομεν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, πῶς ἔτι ζήσομεν ἐν αὐτῇ;—Stromata,* lib. iii. c. ii. vol. i. p. 544, ed. Potter.

[6] 'Solum autem Christum potero Deum dicere sicut idem apostolus:

The internal character of the epistle and its historical allusions coincide with the external evidence, in proving it an authentic production of the apostle. It bears the marks of his vigorous mind; the language and style being remarkably characteristic.

INTEGRITY.

The authenticity of the doxology in xvi. 25–27 has been questioned.

The three verses are found at the end of the 16th chapter in ℵ, B., C., D., E., 16, 66, 80, 137, 176, the Peshito, Vulgate, Memphitic, Ethiopic; in copies mentioned by Origen; in Ambrosiaster, Pelagius, and other Latin writers.

They are placed at the end of the 14th chapter in L., and the great majority of cursive MSS., in most Greek lectionaries, the later Syriac, Sclavonic, Gothic, Armenian (in some MSS.), in copies mentioned by Origen, Chrysostom, Cyril, Theodoret, Damascenus, Theophylact, Oecumenius, Theodulius, &c.

They are found in both places in A. 5, 17, 109, 31?, 73?

They are wanting in F., G., D***, and in copies alluded to by Jerome. Marcion too had not the verses; but he took away the last two chapters, as Origen or Rufinus states.[1] It has also been thought that Tertullian did not read the verses; but the opinion is more than

ex quibus Christus, qui est, inquit, Deus super omnia benedictus in aevum omne.'—*Adv. Praxeam*, c. xiii.

[1] Caput hoc (xvi. 25-27) Marcion, a quo Scripturae evangelicae atque apostolicae interpolatae sunt, de hac epistola penitus abstulit. Et non solum hoc sed et ab eo ubi scriptum est: quod non ex fide est, peccatum est (xv. 23) usque ad finem cuncta dissecuit. In aliis vero exemplaribus, id est, in iis quae non sunt a Marcione temerata, hoc ipsum caput (xvi. 25-27) diverse positum invenimus. In nonnullis etenim codicibus post eum locum quem supra diximus (xiv. 23) statim cohaerens habetur: ei autem qui potens est vos confirmare. Alii codices vero in fine continent.—*Comment. ad Rom.* xvi. 25.

doubtful, for his citing xiv. 10 as being in the closing part (clausula) of the epistle is sufficiently correct.[1]

The preponderance of external testimony is in favour of the authenticity, and of the position at xvi. 25–27.

Internal evidence points another way, for—

1. A doxology at the end of an epistle is contrary to Paul's manner.

2. The epistle had been already completed at the 24th verse, 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ be with you all. Amen,' if that verse be authentic; if not, at the 20th verse.

3. It wants the simplicity of Paul's doxologies, being inflated, exaggerated, obscure, and having awkward constructions. The combination of 'my gospel and the preaching of Jesus Christ' is unpauline and unsuitable. 'To stablish according to my gospel' yields no good sense, and is contrary to the usage of the verb in the New Testament with a preposition, viz. to *stablish in*.[2] And what is the meaning of establishing the Roman Christians, not only according to the gospel of the writer and the preaching of Jesus Christ, but also *according to the revelation of the mystery which was kept secret since the world began?* The construction of the relative pronoun '*to whom* be glory,' &c. is ambiguous.[3] If it be referred to *Jesus Christ* immediately preceding, the idea is contrary to Paul's usage, who never ascribes glory to the Son, but to the Father. If it be referred to *the only wise God*, the doxology is left incomplete. The analogy of the same relative pronoun in Acts xxiv. 6, used irregularly, does not hold good, because Paul is not the writer there. Besides, the expression *by Jesus Christ*[4] is unintelligible here; and Meyer's explanation, 'to God, who appears as the

[1] Adv. Marcion. v. 13.

[2] στηρίζειν ἐν; compare 1 Thess. iii. 13; 2 Thess. ii. 17.

[3] ᾧ ἡ δόξα, κ.τ.λ.

[4] διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

only wise One through Jesus Christ,' is equally unintelligible. These are the chief phenomena in the three verses that strike the reader as peculiar. We admit that their tenor is Pauline, but that arises from the fact that the doxology is made up of expressions from Pauline literature. Thus, 'according to my gospel' is from Rom. ii. 16; 'the revelation of the mystery' from Ephes. iii. 3; 'kept secret since the world began, but now is made manifest,' is from 2 Tim. i. 9, 10; 'according to the commandment of the everlasting God' from Titus i. 3; 'to all nations, for the obedience of faith' from Rom. i. 5; 'by Jesus Christ' from Rom. ii. 16; 'to the only wise God' is either from 1 Tim. i. 17, where, however, the adjective *wise* is spurious; or from Jude 25. The tone given to the whole is in imitation of the similar but appropriate doxology in Hebr. xiii. 20, 21.[1]

Such grounds render it probable that the passage is an addition to the epistle from a later and clumsy hand. It is easy to assert that an interpolator would have avoided difficulties and irregularities of construction, making all simple, facile, and complete; but the assumption implies that he was able to write as well as, if not better than Paŭl, which there is no reason for supposing. An officious compiler may be a bad composer. Unusual, awkward, and obscure phrases, put together in a brief compass, cannot favour identity of authorship with a preceding composition which does not exhibit the same irregularity and harshness, unless it be supposed that the writer became suddenly careless, or was hurried and interrupted. Fritzsche, however, imagines that he had leisure enough;[2] since he makes the apostle dictate the doxology to an amanuensis after he had read over the letter, or heard it read by another. The defenders

[1] See Reiche's Commentarius Criticus in N. T. vol. i. p. 88, *et seq.*

[2] Pauli ad Romanos Epistola, tom. i. pp. xxxviii.-xlix. prolegom.

of the passage, of whom the ablest is Fritzsche, have not succeeded in clearing away the difficulties of language and construction.

The varying position shows the felt unsuitableness of the doxology at the end of the epistle, where it was originally placed. It could not be transferred to the 15th chapter, which is formally concluded; and therefore it was appended to the 14th, where the apostle speaks of the weak, and the words 'to him that is of power to stablish you' appropriately follow. Modern critics have also felt the singularity of its position at the end of the epistle and placed it at xiv. 23. Griesbach and Matthaei, Mill and Wetstein, take this view. De Wette himself, though opposed to it, admits that there is something remarkable in its isolated position at the end of the epistle, after a closing benediction; but has no other explanation to offer than Fritzsche's guess.

The whole of the 16th chapter we take to be spurious. The numerous persons mentioned in it as Paul's acquaintances at Rome though he had never been there, evidence against it. It is true that there was considerable intercourse between the metropolis and the provinces, and that he had known several of the individuals in Asia Minor; but these circumstances are insufficient to account for the long list of those saluted by name, a list which shows obvious desire on the part of the writer to bring the apostle into close friendship with many of the persons named, and to enumerate their meritorious services to him. Andronicus, Junia, and Herodion are his *kinsmen*. Lucius, Jason, and Sosipater, sending salutations, are also his kinsmen. Rufus's mother is termed Paul's mother. Aquila and Priscilla laid down their necks for his life. Mary bestowed much labour on him. It is also said of Andronicus and Junia, that they were 'of note among the apostles, and in Christ' before him. All this savours of a Pauline Christian, who took an

interest in pointing out the close relation which subsisted between Paul and the best-known members of the Roman church. In the epistles written from Rome Paul does not mention the same individuals. Besides, Aquila and Priscilla were at Ephesus shortly before the writing of the epistle; now they are at Rome; and immediately after they reappear at Ephesus. Epenetus, the first fruits of Achaia, is also specified as at Rome; so are Andronicus and Junia fellow-prisoners of his, at a time when he was not in prison.

An attempt has been made to find, among the persons mentioned in the 16th chapter, the names of the members of Caesar's household, who commend themselves to the brethren at Philippi in the Philippian epistle. In the columbaria or sepulchres described by the Marchese Campana and Canina, names of buried persons have been found identical with several in the chapter. Tryphoena, Philologus, Julia Amplias or Ampliatus, Urbana, Apelles, Junia, Rufus, Hermes, Hermas. The coincidence appears striking at first sight; and it is possible that some of the names may point to the very persons specified by the apostle. But most of them were common from the time of Julius Caesar to that of Adrian. Julius and Rufus, Hermes and Hermas, Junia, Urbana, Ampliatus, Apelles, occur more than once in the inscriptions. Tryphoena and Philologus were rarer. Nothing can be built on this foundation. The authenticity of the 16th chapter of the epistle to the Romans, or of the whole work, can hardly be strengthened by coincidences of names possibly identical. We know that Christianity had spread extensively in Rome when Paul wrote to its adherents there; but whether any of Caesar's household had embraced it at the time; whether Tryphoena was attached to the service of Messalina because an inscription has Valeria Tryphoena, the former being the Gentile name of the empress; and whether Philologus belonged to the palace because Livia is found in

the same inscription as that which has his name, it is impossible to affirm.[1]

After the general terms containing nothing characteristic, in which heretics are spoken of (17–20), the severity of tone in the twentieth verse gives colouring to the description, and contrasts with the mild language in the 14th and 15th chapters. It is easy to say, that the errorists referred to *had not caused* divisions, but were only likely to do so, that they were Jewish zealots outside the church different from the Judaisers pointed at in the 14th and 15th chapters; but the language leaves another impression on the mind. 'The God of peace shall bruise Satan (whose instruments these sectaries are) under your feet shortly,' shows Judaisers already active and dangerous.

There is much plausibility in Schulz's conjecture, that xvi. 1–20 was written from Rome to the Ephesians; a conjecture adopted by Ewald, who thinks that xvi. 3–20 was inserted from a lost epistle to the Christians at Ephesus.[2] This conjecture, however, does not explain the difficulties connected with the doxology. How is it that the epistle without xvi. 1–20 or 3–20 has no benediction, but terminates with a doxology, contrary to Paul's manner, the 24th verse being a spurious interpolation? That the whole chapter formed an original part of the Roman epistle, can scarcely be admitted by such as are alive to the internal difficulties in the way of that opinion, and the lame apologies made to meet them.

The critic has only to look calmly at the number and quality of the guesses which the advocates of the 16th chapter make in its favour, to strengthen his doubts of its authenticity. One of its most sensible defenders says, that in the midst of multiplied engagements and a

[1] See Journal of Classical and Sacred Philology, No. x. p. 57, *et seq.*

[2] Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus, p. 428.

short stay at Corinth the apostle was several days, or even weeks, in writing the epistle; that he paused first at xv. 33, intending to finish there; that on the receipt of additional intelligence, with greeting of friends at Rome, he added xvi. 1–16; to which he subjoined the warnings and apparent conclusion in verses 17–20; his definite statements here originating in recent information; and finally, other Christians at Corinth having visited the apostle, and desired him to express their salutations, he added another wish and prayer for the church (xvi. 24). The whole copy having been perused and corrected, the general doxology contained in verses 25–27 was subjoined. 'Nothing stands in the way of believing these things to be altogether probable,' says their simple-minded proposer; to which criticism will reply, a great deal. The opinion that requires them is questionable.

But while we agree with Baur in rejecting the 16th chapter, the 15th cannot be put in the same category. There is an intimate union between the 14th and 15th, which forbids their separation; and the contents of the latter are truly Pauline. The epistle could not have concluded with xiv. 23; and the doxology in xvi. 25–27 never belonged to the former place, though transferred to it in a few ancient copies. None of the arguments adduced by Baur against the spuriousness of the 15th chapter seem conclusive; though his view of the last two chapters may have weight with those who adopt his theory of the whole epistle. It is needless to refer to the many conjectures respecting the two chapters, which are all improbable, except those of Schulz and Ewald. We believe that the 15th was always a part of the letter. There is no foundation for the opinion that the work was ever circulated in two forms, with and without the last two chapters; or that the writer intended it for Christians generally, the dwelling-place being inserted by transcribers agreeably to the context or tradition.

Of the latter there is indeed a trace in G., which omits the words 'in Rome' (i. 7) and 'those in Rome' (i. 15); but A., B., C., far older and better copies, have the inscription, 'to the Romans.'

THE LANGUAGE.

Though it may seem strange, at first sight, that the epistle was not written in Latin the language of the Romans, there is abundant proof of its Greek original. Latin was then the language of northern Africa, where the old Italic version originated, of which revisions were soon made in parts of Italy distant from Rome, not in the metropolis itself. The note of the Syrian scholiast on the Peshito, that Paul wrote in Latin, is groundless. The Greek language was understood and employed at Rome in the first century. The Jews residing there learned it by intercourse with the Greek-speaking inhabitants and with the Romans themselves, many of whom preferred it to the Latin. The oldest Jewish tombs of Rome have Greek inscriptions, as we learn from Aringhi.[1] Gentile Christians generally understood Greek, as we infer from various witnesses; from Martial, Tacitus, Juvenal, and Ovid. Ignatius, Dionysius of Corinth, and Irenaeus wrote in Greek to the Roman Christians. Justin Martyr, who resided in Rome for a time, wrote his apologies to the Roman emperors in the same tongue. Clement and Hermas wrote in Greek. Of the names of the first twelve bishops of Rome, ten are Greek and only two Latin. The diffusion of the Greek language was greatly promoted by the multitudes of Greeks that flocked to the imperial city. The majority of slaves, mechanics, and artisans were of Greek origin; and the Romans, addicted to foreign practices, were ready to adopt the language of the conquered. Hence Greek became the favourite tongue of the edu-

[1] Roma subterranea, vol. i. p. 397, &c.

cated classes. It is also probable that Greeks formed part of the church; though it would be hazardous to assert that the Gentile members were of foreign origin, not native Greeks.

CONTENTS.

The most general division of the epistle is into two parts, one doctrinal, the other practical; the former embracing chapters i.–xi., the latter xii.–xvi. These again may be subdivided.

1. CHAPS. I.–XI.

(*a*) i. 1–v. (*c*) ix.–xi.
(*b*) vi.–viii.

2. CHAPS. XII.–XVI.

(*a*) xii. xiii. (*c*) xv. 14–33.
(*b*) xiv. 1–xv. 13. (*d*) xvi.

Formal divisions cannot be looked for, because the parts run more or less into one another, and pauses are rare. The writer often goes back upon thoughts and develops them in a different way. The most marked pause is at the end of the 8th chapter. The epistle might also terminate at xv. 33.

To the salutation the apostle subjoins a few introductory verses, in which he announces his calling by the Son of God, his gratitude for the faith of the Roman Christians, his continual remembrance of them in prayer, and his great desire to visit them personally for the purpose of imparting some spiritual gift, that they might be established. The importance of the gospel he sets forth in emphatic terms, passing to the great theme of the epistle, justification by faith, in the sixteenth and seventeenth verses (i. 1–17).

He proceeds to show that all men, Gentiles and Jews, are sinners, transgressors of the divine law, and exposed to the wrath of God; and therefore they need

the revelation of the righteousness which is of faith. He demonstrates the sinfulness of the Gentile world (i. 18–32), and affirms that the Jews are equally guilty (ii. 1–29), without distinctly denying their privileges. In consequence of this argument, in which Jew and Gentile are reduced to the same level by the requirements of the moral law, an objection might readily occur to the Jew. What profit is there in belonging to a divine economy? Having advanced what seemed derogatory to Judaism, Paul softens the apparent severity of his statements, by pointing out the privileges and preferences of the Jews (iii. 1–8). After the digression, which interrupts the regular course of the argument, he resumes the line of thought, and sets forth the result which had been already announced to the Jews, as a subject of serious reflection, viz. that there is no difference between them and the Gentiles, since they had forfeited their privileges by unbelief. Both are alike guilty, as is shown by quotations from the Old Testament (iii. 9–20).

Having proved that all need the salvation revealed in the law of righteousness, the apostle sets forward a righteousness of God through faith in Jesus Christ. Here he establishes a theme announced in the seventeenth verse of the 1st chapter, justification by faith without the deeds of law. The Gentile is expressly included in the circle of the faithful; and instead of the law being made void by the doctrine of free salvation, it is established (iii. 21–31).

The question before asked, in reference to the Jew, is now put with relation to Abraham, What advantage had he, if Jew and Gentile are alike? Instead of directly answering it in the negative, he points out that the same righteousness by faith, without the works of the law, was communicated to him even before circumcision, that he might be the father of all believers, Jews or Gentiles. After setting Abraham's faith in a

striking light, the writer applies to all believers what is affirmed of him. The mind of the reader is turned from the fleshly to the spiritual Abraham, with whom the Gentile as well as the Jew may be associated through faith in Christ (iv. 1–25).

The inward fruit of justification by faith is described in the first eleven verses of the 5th chapter. By it the believer obtains peace with God, a hope which enables him to glory in afflictions, and a consciousness of the divine love arising out of the thought that Christ died for him (v. 1–11). In illustrating this topic, he resumes the universal aspect of the plan of salvation already stated, in the persons of the first and second Adam. A stream of death and corruption had flown forth upon the human family from Adam. From Christ the second Adam proceeds a righteousness which sanctifies. All sinned. Death, the consequence of sin, reigned even over persons who had no positive or revealed law, as well as over those who transgressed a written one. Thus sin and death were universal. The salvation of Christ counterbalances the wide-wasting effects of Adam's one offence. It is even more beneficial than the other is destructive. Sentence was passed for one offence, involving condemnation; whereas the free gift has relation to many offences. Where sin abounded, grace abounds much more. The law could not obviate the consequences of sin, but awakened a sense of iniquity, nourishing the desire for a full redemption. Thus the fruits of salvation by faith are compared with the disastrous effects of sin, so as to present a remarkable contrast in favour of the first. The remedy is co-extensive with the disease and even exceeds it. This is illustrated by parables and contrasts between Adam and Christ (v. 12–21).

Having shown the righteousness that is of faith and the superabundance of grace in redemption, in the preceding chapter, he stops to meet an objection that

might be taken to the doctrine on the ground of its tendency to encourage sin. Are we to continue in sin that grace may abound? No; for the Christian is dead to sin, the symbol of which state is baptism. United to Christ, the believer dies with him, and rises again to a new life. Sin has therefore no more dominion over him. He is not under the law, seeking justification by it, but under grace (vi. 1–14). The same argument is now put differently. We cannot sin, because by so doing we become the servants of sin. Christians are freed from the bondage of sin producing death, and have yielded themselves to the service of righteousness (vi. 15–23).

The 6th chapter is directed against Christian antinomianism, as the 3rd was intended to meet Jewish antinomianism. In both cases, error is exposed by taking away the externality of the foundation and showing the inward state or life. Neither privilege nor gift of grace can furnish a motive for acting in opposition to the true subjectivity, in which the substance of the privilege and gift consists.

The writer had said in the fourteenth verse, 'Sin shall not have dominion over you; for ye are not under the law, but under grace.' To illustrate and enforce this, he now compares the relation of the believer to the law, to the case of a wife who has lost her husband. As the widow is free from the law, and may marry again; so the believer, freed from the law, is prepared to be affianced to Christ. Immediately after, the believer is compared to the dead husband, and, like him, is freed from the law. The apostle means to express the same idea in vii. 1–7 as that which he had termed before a *death unto sin*; he presents it now as a death to the law.

Having mentioned in the fifth verse the sinful affections which the law excites, the writer explains and illustrates this at considerable length, showing the ope-

ration of law on the human heart. It is inefficacious to sanctify the soul, and is the occasion of bringing forth fruit unto death, unless there be a death to sin. But it is effectual in imparting the knowledge of sin, which is the first step to amendment. The purport of the passage vii. 7–25 is to assert the true nature of the law and vindicate it from the charge of sin. In doing so, the apostle shows the relation it bears to human nature. It produces uneasiness, conflict, disquietude of mind. By its prohibitions it arouses the evil propensities, and so aggravates human guilt. It does not develop a new life in union with Christ, nor give true peace of conscience. Yet it is not sinful but spiritual, because the better nature approves of it (vii. 7–25).

It is wrong to take the 6th and 7th chapters, with Mangold, as a kind of episode intended to obviate possible misconceptions of v. 20. They belong to the first part of the epistle, which explains and justifies the gospel of righteousness by faith, with relation to scruples about its moral effects.

The apostle now describes the state into which the believer is brought after the combat has passed. He is removed from condemnation, and lives after the tendency of his spiritual nature not according to the flesh (viii. 1–15). By the spirit the Christian is made conscious of his adoption, and participation of the everlasting inheritance provided. This inheritance far exceeds the sufferings of the present life: all long and hope for it; and while cherishing such hope with steadfastness and confidence in God, they cannot be brought to shame. Their heavenly Father has given them a pledge of all other blessings in his only-begotten Son, and they have nothing to fear, because nothing can separate them from the love of God (viii. 16–39).

The 9th, 10th, and 11th chapters are hardly an appendix to the preceding part of the letter. Neither are they the centre and essence of the whole, as Baur

supposes. The theme is still the same as before. The writer justifies still further the righteousness of faith, against the national misgivings of Jewish Christianity. The ancient people of God appeared to be cast back by the free admission of the Gentiles to the salvation of Messiah. This fact was a perplexing one, not only to the Jews but the apostle himself. He endeavours to explain it by the unconditional right of divine election and the blindness of the Jews themselves; but adds a consolatory conclusion, that God has not wholly cast away his people: their fall, which is the occasion of salvation to the Gentiles, is only temporary.

Having demonstrated the necessity, and described the plenitude of salvation by faith alone, the apostle might have concluded his argument. But the admission of the Gentiles is too important to be dismissed with the previous notices of it. Feeling that a religion which insists on faith in Christ as necessary to salvation had not met with acceptance on the part of the Jews, who rejected it in the spirit of a proud exclusiveness, the apostle expresses his deep sorrow for their unbelief, and offers an explanation of that Divine arrangement, in accordance with which the body of the Jewish nation was excluded from the Christian covenant. God's promise to the seed of Abraham had not been frustrated by the rejection of the people, since there was a spiritual, as well as a fleshly heir. He had selected Isaac, to the exclusion of Ishmael, and Jacob in preference to Esau. Nor is there injustice in God's choosing according to his own will. The principle of selection is founded on the divine sovereignty, in the exercise of which He dispenses his mercy as He pleases. There is no ground of objection to this doctrine, because of the uncontrollable necessity imposed on the creature's actions, when Jehovah displays his grace toward some, as He had done to those who were called, and his wrath

towards others, as He had done towards the body of the Jewish nation (ix. 1–29).

Having justified God in selecting some and rejecting others according to his good pleasure, and showed that the prophets themselves spoke of the rejection of the Jews, and the admission of another people, he states that they were the authors of their own fall. While the Gentiles obtained justification, the Jews had not, because seeking it by works. In their zeal for legal righteousness, they overlooked the righteousness of faith. The writer then digresses to notice the objections of the Jews, and shows that they are disproved by their own prophets who foretold the rejection of the nation and admission of the Gentiles (ix. 30–x. 21). After explaining the Divine procedure in rejecting the Jews and calling the Gentiles, the apostle subjoins certain considerations calculated to soothe the minds of his countrymen. God had not wholly cast off his people. He had graciously chosen a remnant to be partakers of salvation. Though the people are given up to their own obduracy as had been predicted in the Old Testament, even in their fall Jehovah had a purpose of mercy. So far from his design *terminating* in the nation's rejection, that very rejection was the means of conferring the privileges of the gospel on the Gentile world. And the Gentiles have no reason to cherish feelings of proud superiority relative to the Jews. After they are converted, Israel will be saved.

A patriotic feeling influences the apostle in saying that Israel will be saved, after all. It is the wish of his heart, not a prediction. He hopes that the fulness of the Gentiles may usher in the salvation of the Jewish nation. The subject is concluded with an ascription of praise to God, whose perfections are unsearchable and ways past finding out; who dispenses all blessings according to his will (xi. 1–36).

The practical or preceptive part of the epistle is

contained in chapters xii.–xv. The admonitions here are partly general, referring to Christian life under all aspects, and partly adapted to the peculiar circumstances of the Roman church. The 12th chapter enjoins personal holiness, unity, humility, and the Christian graces generally. The 13th commands subjection to the existing civil powers; honesty; mutual love enforced by the near approach of the day of the Lord. Here Jewish Christians are specially in view. Apprehension was felt lest they should continue to cherish the sentiments they held respecting heathen rulers before they became Christians, and be tempted to rebel against the government. They submitted to the Roman yoke with uneasiness. Looking at the oppression they had to endure under it, and contrasting their religion with the idolatry of the powers that crushed them, they were inclined to revolt against their rulers. These feelings they carried into the Christian religion. There is no evidence indeed, that the Jewish Christians of the church had become rebels against the reigning authorities, cruel though those authorities were; but the writer was probably aware of manifestations of feeling which might prejudice the Christian cause. The subject was delicate and important. The apostle gives it a general bearing, so that the special circumstances which led to its introduction are liable to be forgotten in the universality of its aspect. His doctrine is passive obedience; one that cannot be followed in all relations without hindering the progress of civilisation in the world. What was best for the Roman Christians, or what the writer seems to inculcate as best generally, is not for all times and relations. Though primitive Christianity did not disturb the existing arrangements of civil society, it does not follow that its true spirit allows bad rulers to act unchecked.

Chapters xiv.–xv. 13 refer to the mutual treatment of the two classes in the church. Probably Essene

elements had penetrated into the ecclesiastical life of the church.[1] The persons called 'weak' belonged to Jewish Christianity, forming an ascetic party who supposed flesh and wine to be 'unclean in themselves' (xiv. 14), and observed the Jewish calendar about fast days. This is more likely than that they were Gentile ascetics, whose minds had received a tinge of oriental theosophy. In relation to them the apostle enforces the principle of charity. The strong and the weak were not to condemn one another, but to live in peace. At the fourteenth verse of the 15th chapter, he resumes the personal narrative, and justifies the boldness he had used towards the Roman Christians by his apostolic office, which leads him to speak of the large success attending his labours, the wide sphere of his activity, especially in fields unoccupied, and his long-projected journey to Rome after he had visited Jerusalem. In anticipation of the dangers and obstacles with which that journey was beset, he requests the prayers of his readers, and concludes with a benediction (xv. 14–33).

The 16th chapter contains a recommendation of Phebe, the bearer of the letter, various salutations, a warning against persons who caused dissensions, and an ascription of praise to God (xvi. 1–27).

From this brief analysis it will appear that the apostle does not follow a determinate plan. The separate parts of the epistle are not elaborated in logical relation to the whole. The sequences and turns of thought, the phrases and connecting particles, result from no studied purpose. Systematic precision cannot be attributed to the work. There may have been a clearly defined outline in the writer's mind when he began, and to which he adhered in the main; but great freedom appears in details. Digressions occur; sudden interruptions of the train of thought by subordinate

[1] Ritschl's Altkatholische Kirche, p. 232, *et seq.* 2nd ed.

ideas; parenthetic clauses;[1] plays upon words. There are also repetitions. The apostle reverts to the same thoughts, and expresses them differently. Calm progression towards one conclusion is not his method; retrogression marks his path as well. He breaks off the thread of discourse, and returns to it. He avoids saying directly what he had indirectly established, and introduces the utterance of strong feeling instead. Conflicting emotions in his mind influence modes of expression; and convictions are softened by motives of delicacy or ardent love of the nation. Figurative language supplies the place of prosaic statement. Arguments and illustrations from the Old Testament are freely used. The prophets are quoted to show what they did not intend. Their words are applied in a sense alien to the connection, or adapted by alteration to a particular purpose. Important terms occur in shifting senses, and elude attempts to fasten them to the same ideas. They narrow and widen according to the will of the author or the exigencies of the places they occupy. Thus the words rendered *law*, *creature*, *righteousness*, *justification*, vary in sense even in the same context, refusing to speak the exact alphabet of theologians who disfigure revelation by throwing the sacred writers into one crucible and drawing out a harmonious system; or by confining an author like Paul to a circle of ideas expressed in exact phraseology. Nothing can be more improper than to treat his language as though it were logically precise; to build up doctrinal propositions on isolated sentences, or to make them polished stones in the structure of a creed. His

[1] Too many parentheses have been assumed by unskilful interpreters, of which v. 13-17 and ix. 3 are examples. The latter is peculiarly unfortunate ('for I myself did wish to be anathema from Christ'), as if the words referred to the time prior to Paul's conversion; whereas Paul only expresses, in hyperbolical language, the affection he bore to his countrymen. The English version, 'I could wish myself accursed' is sufficiently accurate.

thoughts and phraseology must be taken as they are, in their general breadth and bearing. The forcible outpourings of an inspired mind, they can never cease to stimulate and instruct those who read; but they cannot satisfy the speculative and philosophical. Christianity is for all, for the childlike and teachable more than the critical; and the greatest expounder of it, after its Founder, will be better appreciated by the humble-minded learner than the philosopher. The truths on which he insists appeal to the moral instincts of man, and while approved by the highest judgment, fail to satisfy scientific processes of argument because they are for mankind in the aggregate not an educated portion merely; for humanity as it is, with its broad hopes and fears, its wants and weaknesses, rather than the select few who philosophise about problems remote from the uppermost necessities of the heart.

PARAGRAPHS INTERPRETED.

'Wherefore, as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned. (For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression, who is the figure of him that was to come. But not as the offence, so also is the free gift. For if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many. And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift: for the judgment was by one to condemnation, but the free gift is of many offences unto justification. For if by one man's offence death reigned by one; much more they which receive abundance of grace and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one, Jesus Christ.)

Therefore as by the offence of one judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous' (v. 12–19).

This passage has been minutely canvassed by controversial theologians; and has served as the foundation of current dogmas among polemics. It has been built upon with laborious skill, as if it contained important truth which it were unsafe either to misapprehend or deny. We must restrict ourselves to the barest outline of its meaning, leaving the reader to fill it out for himself.

The construction is irregular. There is no clause corresponding to, 'as by one man sin entered into the world and death by sin, and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned;' and the apodosis has to be supplied out of 'who is the figure of him that was to come' (verse 14). The writer turns aside from the construction at the beginning and adopts another.

Sin entered into the world by one man, i.e. by Adam; *and death by sin.* Sin is here spoken of as a person. It does not mean what is called *original sin.* The entrance of sin into the world by Adam's act of transgression caused death, i.e. physical death. Whether such death solely, it is difficult to decide, because spiritual and physical death may be comprehended in the one word. The latter was predominant in the apostle's mind; we cannot say that the former was altogether excluded.

And so death passed upon all men, for that all sinned. In consequence of the connection between Adam's sin and death as cause and effect, death came upon all, inasmuch as all sinned. Does this language mean that all sinned *in and with* Adam as their representative? The thirteenth verse does not harmonise with an affirmative answer. The true interpretation is that which

regards the actual sins of individuals. As Adam died because he sinned, so all mankind die because they sin. Imputed sin is foreign to the passage and the epistle.

For until the law sin was in the world: but sin is not imputed when there is no law.

This verse meets an objection arising from what the apostle had already asserted, 'where no law is, there is no transgression.' How could all be sinners during the interval which elapsed from Adam to the giving of the Mosaic law, when there was no law? Sin is not charged to men where there is no law.

Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses, even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adam's transgression.

Notwithstanding this non-imputation of sin it still existed, as is proved by the fact that men died from Adam to Moses, even though they did not like Adam break a law distinctly promulgated.

Who is the figure of him that was to come. The apostle institutes a comparison between Adam and Christ, representing them as type and antitype. The comparison is rather by way of contrast, for the object of it is to show that greater benefits have resulted from the work of Christ than evils from Adam's fall. The cases of the offence and the free gift are different. If many died through the fall of one, much more has the grace of God, and the gift by grace, coming through one man, Jesus Christ, abounded to many. There is another contrast. The effects of the offence and of the free gift are condemnation and justification—condemnation to many, arising from one man's offence; justification, after many offences, by one man's righteousness.

The eighteenth verse resumes the parallel begun at the twelfth, and puts the particulars of similarity and dissimilarity together. As by one offence judgment came upon all men to condemnation, so the free gift

came upon all men to justification of life, by one sentence of justification. The *all* in the first case are the descendants of Adam; so are they in the second, because the sentence of justification has been passed once for all, and brings eternal life to such as appropriate it. Its consequences are available for all, and become real as soon as believed. Many were made sinners by the disobedience of one man, and many shall be made righteous by the obedience of one. How this takes place is not explained. The writer wishes to inculcate the great truth, that the reign of grace exceeds the reign of sin.

The apostle expresses a connection between Adam and his posterity, by means of which Adam's sin and death were the occasion of the sin and death of his posterity. 'By one man many were made sinners.' Elsewhere, 'In Adam all die.' Whether he had a definite idea of this connection may be doubted, because he was intent on his parallel. Theologians however have put, or attempted to put, precision into his language, by representing him as teaching that *all men sinned in and with Adam*, and therefore that his sin, or the guilt of it, is imputed to his posterity. According to this, persons are liable to the penalty of spiritual death because of their sin with Adam. Such is the doctrine of *original sin*, *deduced from* the apostle's language but not expressed by it. Sin is the act of a conscious being who has a perception of right and wrong; and none can be rightly punished for another's sin, else the Judge of all the earth would act contrary to the moral sense He has implanted. Sin is not imputed to one who does not sin himself; and such language as *sinning in Adam* can only be figurative at best. If it mean that 'Adam's sin was as truly the sin of every one of his posterity, as if it had been personally committed by him,' principles of justice are attributed to God at variance with his moral perfections. The utmost that

can be meant is, that the propensity to sin appeared in such a way as it would not have done, if Adam had not commenced to sin. But that idea would have been more clearly expressed, had the apostle intended it. Appeal is made to the case of young children who die, it is said, because of their participation in the guilt of Adam's sin, before they commit actual transgression; but the question of children is foreign to the passage which treats of the whole human race. It is not likely that the writer thought of children, or if he did, he was wise enough to refrain from predicating sin of them at one age and not another, as if man could tell when they begin to sin. It is supposed that the proof of the statement in the twelfth verse, adduced in the thirteenth and following, shows that death was not caused by the actual sins of individuals, but by Adam's sin alone. But that is incorrect. The proof is of another kind. If in the interval between Adam and Moses, men died in consequence of their sins, without having an express law threatening death as the consequence of disobedience to God's command, the case amounts to this only, that the power of sin, which Adam first put into operation, worked in those intermediate generations, bringing with it death as it did to him; and therefore the necessary consequence of sin is seen in its universality.

In explaining these passages, it should never be forgotten that the language is figurative; that the writer was not a western logician conducting a train of reasoning, but a man of strong feeling drawing comparisons to set forth one or two ideas; inexact in language, using single words without studied selection, and careless of construction or syntax. He did not mean to enunciate doctrinal propositions such as theologians insert in creeds to be subscribed; but to utter general truth broadly and strongly, in language flowing from the heart. Those therefore who evolve from his words a grammatical theology, or bring grammar and

lexicon to make them do their duty in defining scientific doctrine, mistake the character of his writing. The language of oriental feeling, which is eminently rhetorical, disdains logical precision. It teaches by illustration or comparison—not in the well-selected terms of a dogmatic theology.

"What shall we say then? Is the law sin? God forbid. Nay, I had not known sin, but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet. But sin, taking occasion by the commandment, wrought in me all manner of concupiscence. For without the law sin was dead. For I was alive without the law once: but when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. And the commandment, which was ordained to life, I found to be unto death. For sin, taking occasion by the commandment, deceived me, and by it slew me. Wherefore the law is holy, and the commandment holy, and just, and good. Was then that which is good made death unto me? God forbid. But sin, that it might appear sin, working death in me by that which is good; that sin by the commandment might become exceeding sinful. For we know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin. For that which I do I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I. If then I do that which I would not, I consent unto the law that it is good. Now then it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. For I know, that in me, (that is, in my flesh,) dwelleth no good thing: for to will is present with me; but how to perform that which is good I find not. For the good that I would I do not: but the evil which I would not, that I do. Now if I do that I would not, it is no more I that do it, but sin that dwelleth in me. I find then a law, that, when I would do good, evil is present with me. For I delight in the law of God after the inward man: But I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and

bringing me into captivity to the law of sin which is in my members. O wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me from the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord. So then with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin' (vii. 7–25).

This paragraph is perplexing to interpreters. As the language of it is not consistent with itself, and opposite states of feeling are expressed in various clauses, commentators have been at a loss about the general meaning. The leading question which arises on its perusal is: Does the apostle speak of a regenerate or unregenerate man? Before attempting an answer, it should be stated, that however the language may appear to change in the latter part, there is no good reason for dividing the paragraph into two and appropriating them to such different persons as the unregenerate and regenerate respectively. Verses 7–14, and 15–25 refer to the same general state of mind. As to the main point, whether the unrenewed or renewed man is described, if a categorical answer be demanded, it must be given in favour of the former. But no light is thrown on the interpretation by restricting the passage to one or the other; and the phraseology affords satisfactory ground for neither. Both classes of commentators—those who apply it to Christians and such as refer it to the unregenerate, are compelled to modify phrases which seem to stand in their way, as soon as they begin fairly to look at grammatical or linguistic considerations. Both are right and both wrong. The paragraph does not belong either to the unregenerate or to the regenerate alone, because, as Jowett truly says, 'Mankind are not divided into regenerate and unregenerate, but are in a state of transition from one to the other, or too dead and unconscious to be included in either.' The writer describes a conflict and progress in the soul, from its being awakened to a consciousness of sin by the law, till its emancipation and

victory spoken of in the commencement of the 8th chapter. There is no regular progression in the combat. The stages are not described in exact gradation. Yet there is advancement notwithstanding. The soul's struggles become less violent as the power of sin grows weaker. The will gradually exercises more control over the knowledge and actions.

The *I* is rather an ideal person, than the apostle himself. As the nature is divided into flesh and spirit, the *I* shifts from the one to the other, or hovers between them. And as to the law spoken of, the writer had regard to the Mosaic law more than any other, though he did not mean that law in all cases. The law written in the heart was also in his thoughts.

The state described is to some extent ideal. Few men pass through all its stages, though many pass through some of them. Deep consciousness of sin, with imperfect views of the love of God and of the moral law, will often produce a spiritual combat in strong minds. It was so with Luther. The experience of the apostle himself doubtless supplied some of the moods which he exhibits. The goodness of law, as well as its evil, are seen in the description. The condition is not a *law-state*, to use the phrase of the old divines; nor is it what they call a *gospel-state* of mind. It is a mixed condition—an incipient spirituality advancing to freedom and peace of conscience. The lower nature is checked by the higher; and though the will is enlightened, it does not uniformly carry out its determinations. Here as in other parts of the epistle, the writer uses the language of strong feeling, and paints the phases of a mind conscious of sin in shifting colours, agreeably to the varying shades of light and darkness which pass over it. It is therefore incorrect to press his phraseology into the service of theological systems, as Augustine did against Pelagianism. The further it is kept from the crucible of controversialists, the more intelligible

it becomes. Why should there be so great anxiety to make it suit either the regenerate or unregenerate man, as if the states of mind characteristic of each could be always defined? Is there no transition of the one into the other—no blending of spiritual states of mind with unspiritual ones? Does not the flesh often get the better of the spirit in the Christian? Does not the spirit often control the flesh in him who is but half Christian in character and action?

It obscures the interpretation of vii. 7–25, to bring it into antithesis to viii. 1–17, as Tholuck does after Turretin. The two are not antagonistic, descriptive of non-Christian and Christian character respectively; the latter is the ultimate issue of the former. The difference between them is one of time and degree, not of essence. The final triumph of the spirit over the flesh is the aim and end of the spiritual combat described so vividly in vii. 7–25. The two complete the description of a state in which the awakened conscience, struggling to get free from the trammels of guilt, suffers many reverses, but is at length released from the painful conflict, and has peace. The triumph is complete, but seldom realised in actual experience without recurring struggles.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1847; Jowett, 1859; Meyer, 1859; Tholuck, 1856; Philippi, 1856; Jatho, 1858, 1859; Fritzsche, 1836–1843; Reiche, 1833, 1834; Stuart, 1838; Stengel, 1854; and Ewald, 1857.

THE EPISTLE TO PHILEMON.

THE PERSON TO WHOM THE EPISTLE WAS ADDRESSED.

PHILEMON was a person of distinction in the church at Colosse, remarkable for his Christian activity and hospitality. The position he occupied among the believers there is unknown. The apostle calls him his *fellow-labourer*, an appellation which has led many to suppose that he filled an office, either that of elder or deacon. The title does not necessarily indicate office. Ecclesiastical tradition makes him bishop at Colosse, and a martyr in Rome under Nero. According to Michaelis, his house was a spacious one, because a part of the Christian community assembled in it, and travelling Christians were entertained. Others suppose that his premises were not very extensive, because the apostle requested him to prepare a lodging in a hired house, where he might receive all that came to him. It is probable that he was a man of substance in the place. The nineteenth verse shows that he had been converted by Paul, perhaps at Ephesus, for there is no evidence that the apostle was ever at Colosse. Benson[1] argues that Philemon received the gospel from some of Paul's converts or assistants such as Timothy, or one of the persons mentioned in Coloss. iv. 10, &c. and in Philemon (verse 23). His conversion would thus be owing to the apostle *indirectly*. But the expressions in the

[1] Paraphrase on the Epistle to Philemon, p. 338.

nineteenth verse are too strong for this. If some of the Colossians went to Ephesus and heard Paul preach there, could not Philemon have been one of their number?

Philemon had a church in his house, not consisting, as some suppose of the members of his own family merely, but of other believers. In connection with Philemon is mentioned Archippus, the same person spoken of in the epistle to the Colossians (iv. 17). Many think he was Philemon's son. Apphia may have been his wife. All seem to have been connected by family ties, or to have belonged to the little circle termed *the church in the house*; else Apphia would not have been introduced into a private letter. Onesimus, Philemon's slave, has been metamorphosed by tradition into bishop of Berea in Macedonia, and is said to have suffered martyrdom at Rome. Others identify him with Onesimus bishop of Ephesus.

OCCASION OF THE LETTER.

The slave Onesimus had run away from his master at Colosse, fearing punishment for some crime or act of disobedience. It has been thought that he robbed Philemon (verses 11–18), but that is uncertain. The eighteenth verse, in which the word translated *wronged*,[1] is explained by the verb *owes*,[2] may refer to *theft*, *something taken from* his master, but not necessarily so. Another opinion is, that he had been idle, and had run away to escape work; in which case the loss of service is referred to in the 18th verse. The language appears to us to denote some act of theft he had committed.

At Rome he had found Paul and been converted to the Christian faith. Perhaps he had known the apostle before.

It is unnecessary to suppose that Philemon was keen and obstinate in his resentments, to account for the

[1] ἠδίκησε. [2] ὀφείλει.

solicitude shown by the apostle in the matter. As far as we can gather from the letter, his disposition was benevolent. When Paul despatched Tychicus to Colosse, with a letter to the Christians there, he took the opportunity of sending Onesimus back to his master with the present one, recommending him to his confidence.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The time and place of writing are determined by the epistles to the Colossians and Philippians. The apostle was a prisoner, not at Caesarea, as is generally supposed, but at Rome. Onesimus had charge of the letter to his former master and travelled in company with Tychicus. It should be dated A.D. 62, and was the first of those written in the Roman captivity.

AUTHENTICITY.

The authenticity was unquestioned till Baur.

Supposed allusions to it in the Ignatian epistles must be omitted as irrelevant. The three places which Kirchhofer quotes from the epistles to the Ephesians, Magnesians, and Polycarp, are too remote to be trusted. The earliest writer who expressly alludes to it is Tertullian: 'This epistle alone has had an advantage from its brevity, for by that it has escaped the falsifying hands of Marcion. Nevertheless, I wonder that when he receives one epistle to one man, he should reject two to Timothy, and one to Titus, which treat of the government of the church.'[1] Here it is asserted that Marcion received it into his canon.

It is in the Muratorian list.[2]

Origen speaks of it thus: 'Which Paul being aware

[1] Soli huic epistolae brevitas sua profuit, ut falsarias manus Marcionis evaderet. Miror tamen cum ad unum hominem literas factas receperit, quid ad Timotheum duas, et unam ad Titum de ecclesiastico statu compositas recusaverit.—*Adv. Marcion.* v. 42.

[2] See Credner's Zur Geschichte des Kanons, p. 76.

of, in the epistle to Philemon said to Philemon about Onesimus,' &c.[1] Again: 'As Paul says to Philemon, "We have great joy and consolation in thy love, because the bowels of the saints are refreshed by thee, brother." '[2]

Elsewhere: 'Of Paul it was said to Philemon, "Being such an one as Paul the aged," since he was a young man when Stephen was stoned for the testimony of Christ, and he kept the garments of them that slew him.'[3]

Eusebius also includes it in the canon.[4] Jerome, commenting on the epistle, alludes to some who either rejected or made objections to it; and in answering the objections affirms that it had been always received by all the churches.[5]

In the time of Jerome[6] there were some who did not receive it, asserting that it had been rejected by most of the ancients, which was a mistake. From the unimportant nature of its contents, these doubters supposed either that it did not proceed from Paul, or that he wrote it in his private, unapostolic capacity.

According to Baur, the language is unpauline. A considerable number of expressions do not appear in Paul's writings, but only in the epistles of questionable authenticity, such as *fellow-soldier* (2) figuratively, occurring in the pastoral epistles, *to enjoin that which is convenient* (8), *the aged* (9), *unprofitable, profitable* (11), *to receive* (15), *repay, owe* (19), *to have joy of* (20), *a*

[1] ὅπερ καὶ ὁ Παῦλος ἐπιστάμενος, ἔλεγεν ἐν τῇ πρὸς Φιλήμονα ἐπιστολῇ τῷ Φιλήμονι περὶ τοῦ Ὀνησίμου, κ.τ.λ.—*Homil. in Jerem.* 19.

[2] Sicut Paulus ad Philemona dicit, Gaudium enim magnum habuimus, et consolationem in charitate tua, quia viscera sanctorum requieverunt per te, frater.—*Comment. in Matt.* tract. 34.

[3] De Paulo autem dictum est ad Philemona, Hunc autem ut Paulus senex, cum esset adolescentulus quando Stephanus pro Christi testimonio lapidabatur, et ipse vestimenta servabat interficientium eum.—*Ibid.* tract. 33.

[4] Hist. Eccles. iii. c. 25.

[5] Comment. in Ep. ad Philem.—*Opp.* vol. iv. p. 442.

[6] Prooem. comment. in Ep. ad Philem.

lodging (22), the thrice repeated *bowels*, a word, however, not unpauline.[1] It is also said, that the letter contains improbabilities; that it exhibits the beginning of a romance literature, like the Clementine homilies, the tendency of the romance being to show that what is lost on earth is gained in heaven. If we suppose that Paul and Onesimus were previously acquainted, and that the latter went to the apostle when he began to repent of his flight, no room will be left for that peculiar coincidence of accidental circumstances which Baur finds in the letter.[2]

CONTENTS.

The apostle states the case of Onesimus to Philemon, and entreats him to receive his servant again, not as a slave but a Christian brother. The first three verses contain the dedication and salutation. After this the writer thanks God for what he had heard of Philemon's faith and love towards the Lord Jesus and all saints, expressing his joy that he had behaved so generously to Christians (1–7). The proper subject of the letter begins at the eighth verse, and is continued till the twenty-first. As an apostle, he might have enjoined Philemon to do what Christian principle required in respect to Onesimus; but he rather chooses, as the aged prisoner of Christ, to beseech him to receive Onesimus, confessing that though he had behaved improperly he was now a different person. Paul might have retained him to minister to himself, but would do nothing without Philemon's consent, Providence had made his departure the means of his reformation, that his master might receive him for ever, not as a slave, but a brother. He therefore entreats

[1] *συστρατιώτης, ἐπιτάσσειν τὸ ἀνῆκον, πρεσβύτης, ἄχρηστος, εὔχρηστος, ἀπέχειν, ἀποτίνειν, προσοφείλειν, σου ὀναίμην, ξενία, σπλάγχνα.*

[2] Paulus der Apostel, pp. 475–480.

Philemon to take him back, promising to pay or requite the master for any wrong the slave had done, should the former require it. But he is confident that the master will exceed the request (8–21). The last four verses are the conclusion, in which the writer desires Philemon to provide him a lodging, sends salutations from several fellow-labourers, and wishes his correspondent the rich communication and continual presence of the favour of Jesus Christ.

The nineteenth verse shows that the apostle wrote the letter himself, to make the effect certain. Bertholdt's inference from it, that the preceding portion did not proceed from the apostle's own hand, is incorrect.

The letter is a friendly, not a doctrinal one. It relates to a private matter between Philemon and his slave. But though it is of little importance as a public document relating to Christian truth or history, it is not without use, because it serves as a practical commentary on Coloss. iv. 6, putting Paul's character in a light which none other of his writings exhibits. The qualities which dictated its composition are eminently attractive. Dignity, generosity, prudence, friendship, affection, politeness, skilful address, purity, are apparent. Hence it has been called with great propriety, *the polite epistle.* True delicacy, fine address, consummate courtesy, nice strokes of rhetoric, make it a unique specimen of the epistolary style. It shows the perfect Christian gentleman.

Doddridge has compared it to an epistle of Pliny supposed to have been written on a similar occasion, pronouncing it far superior as a human composition; though antiquity furnishes no example of the epistolary style equal to that of the younger Pliny to Sabinian.

The opinion advocated by Wieseler[1] and Thiersch[2]

[1] Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalt. u. s. w., p. 452, *et seq.*

[2] Versuch zur Herstellung des historischen Standpunkts u. s. w., p. 424, note 46.

that the epistle to the Laodiceans mentioned in Coloss. iv. 16 is identical with the present one to Philemon, rests on mere assumptions,—such as, that our letter was not addressed to Philemon alone but also to Archippus; and that both belonged to Laodicea. Nothing appears to us more certain than that they were members of the Christian community at Colosse.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1847; Meyer, 1859; Wiesinger, 1850; Koch, 1846; and Ewald, 1857.

THE EPISTLE TO THE COLOSSIANS.

COLOSSE AND ITS CHURCH.

COLOSSE, a city of Phrygia Pacatiana, was situated on the river Lycus, not far from Laodicea and Hierapolis. The name is written both *Colosse* and *Colassae*; ancient authorities being divided between them. The best editors, however, such as Lachmann and Tischendorf, adopt the latter.

It is called a great city by Herodotus. Xenophon styles it *prosperous* and *large*. Its greatness sank when Laodicea and Hierapolis rose into importance, first under the Selucidae and then the Romans. Strabo puts it amongst several other *little towns*,[1] which lay around Apamea and Laodicea. In the time of Paul it was neither large nor wealthy.

At what time a church was founded there cannot be discovered; but it must have been after the period specified in Acts xviii. 23, as we infer from a comparison of Coloss. ii. 1 with Acts xviii. 23. The community consisted mainly of Gentile Christians, according to i. 25, 27; ii. 11, 13; iii. 5, 7.

WHO PLANTED THE CHURCH.

Some attribute the origin of the church to Paul himself; others to Epaphras or one of Paul's disciples. On

[1] πολίσματα.

this point, the notices leading to a conclusion are neither definite nor satisfactory.

Lardner has stated most of the considerations, founded on the epistle itself and that to Philemon, in support of the view that the church was planted by the apostle himself.[1] Schulz[2] and Wiggers[3] have added others. The following is a summary of them.

1. We learn from the Acts that Paul travelled twice through Phrygia. Hence it is probable that in one or other journey he visited the principal cities, Colosse and Laodicea. Is it likely that he went through the country without planting churches in cities and towns so important as these?

The fact that the apostle travelled twice through Phrygia, does not prove that he visited Colosse and Laodicea. In his first journey, he passed from Cilicia and Derbe to Lystra, thence through the north-east of Phrygia, to Galatia, Mysia, and Troas. Thus, his route lay north of Laodicea, Hierapolis, and Colosse. In his second journey, he went from Lystra to Phrygia, thence northward to Galatia, and subsequently to Troas. This route was also to the north of those three cities. It is possible that he may have turned aside from the direct way and have traversed *all the country* of Galatia and Phrygia in order (Acts xviii. 23); but the word *all* is not in the original; and if Phrygia possessed sixty-two towns, as Hierocles states, he could not have published the gospel in all. Probably, however, there were not so many towns then as in the sixth century.

2. The epistle exhibits proofs of the intimacy subsisting between the writer and the Colossian believers. He seems to have a correct knowledge of their state, is confident that they had been grounded in the faith, speaks of their love to him, and gives such exhorta-

[1] Works, vol. iii. 4to ed.
[2] Studien und Kritiken, 1829.
[3] Studien und Kritiken, 1838.

tions as imply a personal acquaintance, and induce the belief that he first taught them (i. 6, 8, 23; ii. 5–7, 20–23; iv. 3, 4, 7–9. The salutations also in iv. 10, 11–14, suppose the Colossians to have been well acquainted with Paul's fellow-travellers and fellow-labourers; while those contained in the fifteenth and seventeenth verses of the same chapter, prove that the apostle knew the state of the churches in Colosse and Laodicea.

3. Paul does in effect say that he had himself dispensed the gospel to these Colossians (i. 21–29).

It is remarkable that the apostle does not once allude to the fact of his having founded the church himself. Yet this is stated on other occasions, especially when the members were in danger of being seduced by Judaising teachers from the faith they had been taught; or when they had already apostatised (compare Gal. i. 6). Even when commending Epaphras to their affectionate regard, the apostle does not say that *he* had built on the foundation already laid; or that they should receive his instructions because they coincided with those given by himself. And though various allusions are made to the Colossians having heard the gospel (i. 5, 23), it is never stated that they got it from himself. We admit that the apostle shows his anxiety for their state, his knowledge of their circumstances, his familiarity with their belief, and with the progress they had made in divine things; but he was informed of these by Epaphras. If it be remembered, that Paul had the care of all the churches—that he watched over them with parental solicitude though he may not have planted them—the passages supposed to imply personal acquaintance with the Colossians cease to appear strange. He came to know by his fellow-labourers and messengers, the peculiar influences to which the converts were exposed. It was therefore natural that the Colossians should entertain a high veneration for the apostle. They

owed their conversion to him, indirectly at least. They had heard of his abundant labours and self-denying zeal on behalf of the Gentiles; and they might look to him as their spiritual father, in consequence of the relation which Epaphras and others sustained to both. Not to have written as he did, would have resembled another than the ardent apostle, whose heart was wide enough to embrace all the churches. The tenor of the epistle implies that the Colossians were converts, disciples, friends; not necessarily, that they were the author's *immediate* disciples. Those who think them such, measure the feelings of apostles by a modern standard.

4. The Colossians were endowed with spiritual gifts (iii. 16), which they could have received from none but an apostle.

We do not admit the interpretation of iii. 16, which implies the possession of spiritual gifts. The Colossians had not the power of making, but only of singing, spiritual songs; and if this requires a supernatural endowment, every man singing the psalms of David must have a supernatural gift, as Michaelis observes.

5. In ii. 1, 2, we read: 'For I would that ye knew what great conflict I have for you, and for them at Laodicea, and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh; that *their* hearts might be comforted, being knit together in love,' &c. Here the change of persons implies that the Colossians had seen his face, else the writer would have said *your* not *their*.

According to this interpretation given by Theodoret and Lardner, two classes are specified: first, the inhabitants of Colosse and Laodicea; secondly, those who had not seen Paul's face. The last clause intimates by contrast, that the Colossians and Laodiceans had seen him personally, especially as the third person (*their* hearts) immediately follows (not *your* hearts).

The pronoun need create no difficulty. In conse-

quence of the preceding word rendered *as many as*, the pronoun is in the third, instead of the second person, the more so as *they of Laodicea* are alluded to in the same person. The last clause explains the two preceding, pointing to the fact that the Colossians and Laodiceans had not seen his face. On this supposition the clauses have a significance and coherence which Theodoret's explanation destroys. The last is added to show that the apostle's anxiety was not confined to such as were personally known; but that others shared in his solicitude. If the former lay nearer his heart, the latter were not forgotten. Hence the phrase, 'and for as many as have not seen my face in the flesh,' is subjoined to express the strength of the writer's inward conflict in relation to such as he had not seen. The whole passage, so far from constituting an argument in favour of Paul's founding the church at Colosse, has an opposite bearing.

6. The epistle to Philemon affords evidence that Paul had been among the Colossians; for the nineteenth verse implies that Philemon had been converted by him, probably at the home of the former. He also salutes by name Apphia, the wife of Philemon; and Archippus, probably pastor at Colosse; he desires Philemon to prepare him a lodging; Philemon is styled his fellow-labourer and Archippus his fellow-soldier; all implying personal acquaintance and mutual co-operation in one place, perhaps Colosse.

The epistle to Philemon does not furnish sufficient evidence that Paul had been present with the Colossians; and he had converted Philemon, not at Colosse but Ephesus. The salutation of Archippus and his wife by name does not argue previous acquaintance; since Epaphras may have told him of them.

7. Wiggers refers to i. 7, 'As ye have *also* learned of Epaphras,' implying that Epaphras was not their *first* instructor but that the apostle preceded him in

that capacity. The conjunction *also* is spurious, having been expunged from the text by recent editors.

8. The same scholar refers to the verb *I am absent* (ii. 5), as implying the writer's previous presence. The verb is contrasted with Paul's *presence in the spirit*: 'Though I be absent in the flesh, yet am I with you in the spirit.'

9. The apostle sends a salutation from Timothy to the Colossians (i. 1), whence the evangelist was known to them. But Timothy travelled with Paul through Phrygia (Acts xvi. 3), without leaving him, as far as we are aware. The apostle, therefore, must also have been known to the Colossians; which is tantamount to saying that he abode in their city, and taught them.

It is probable that Timothy had a share in instructing the church. If so, he might well have been in the city without Paul. Even granting that he did not leave the apostle during either of his Phrygian journeys, he might be appropriately joined with him in the salutation, because known to the Colossians by report.

10. The expression 'Epaphras who is one of you,' would not have been applied to this teacher had he founded the church; for the same is said of Onesimus who had been recently converted (iv. 9). In speaking of Epaphras, the apostle never adds 'by whom ye believe,' or 'by whom ye were brought to the fellowship of the gospel.'

Epaphras is described as a native of Colosse, and therefore he took a special interest in the welfare of his fellow-citizens. What language could be more adapted to draw forth the sympathy and affection of the Colossians than that of iv. 12, 13? It is true he is also said to be *one* of the Colossians; but the succeeding contexts distinguish the phrase which is applied in the first instance to Onesimus and in the second to Epaphras.

We believe that the church at Colosse was planted by Epaphras not Paul. It is strange that so little

is said of the former. The apostle styles him *a servant of Christ; my fellow-prisoner in Christ Jesus; our dear fellow-servant, who is for you a faithful minister of Christ.* He may perhaps have been sent, during the apostle's long abode at Ephesus, to preach in those parts of Asia Minor and of Phrygia which Paul could not visit in person. If so, all confidence would be placed in him, as teaching the same doctrines and duties with his master.

But though the church was founded by Epaphras, he was not its only teacher. Others assisted him—Archippus, Philemon, and Timothy. He is not identical with Epaphroditus one of the Philippian pastors, as Grotius supposes; though the one name is an abbreviated form of the other.

It is consistent with the view now given, that the apostle does not address *the church* at Colossè, as he does in the epistles to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, and Galatians; nor the saints together with the bishops and deacons, as at the commencement of the Philippian one, but *the saints and faithful brethren.* Does not this language imply that they were not constituted into a formal church with elders and deacons; which they would doubtless have been, if Paul had preached the gospel there several years before?

AUTHENTICITY.

The authorship of the letter is well attested by external evidence. Irenaeus writes: 'And again in the epistle to the Colossians (Paul) says; "Luke, the beloved physician, greets you"' (Coloss. iv. 14).[1]

Clement of Alexandria has these words: 'And in the epistle to the Colossians he (Paul) writes,' &c.[2]

[1] Et iterum in epistola quae est ad Colossenses, ait: Salutat vos Lucas, medicus dilectus.—*Adv. Haeres.* iii. 14, 1.

[2] Κἂν τῇ πρὸς Κολοσσαεῖς ἐπιστολῇ, νουθετοῦντες, γράφει, κ.τ.λ.—*Stromata*, lib. i. p. 277, ed. Colon. 1688.

Tertullian has the following: 'From which things the apostle restraining us, expressly cautions against philosophy and vain deceit when he writes to the Colossians, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, after the tradition of men; contrary to the foresight of the Holy Spirit."'[1]

Apparent reminiscences of the letter by Justin Martyr appear both in his 'Dialogue with Trypho,' and 'Apologies,' where he says, 'Christ is *the first-born of all things made, the first-born of God, and before all the creatures.*'[2]

It is uncertain, however, whether these expressions were drawn from the epistle, or from the philosophy of Justin's time, along with the Old Testament, the epistle of Clement, and the 'Shepherd' of Hermas. There is no doubt that Paul's letter to the Colossians in which the Son of God's pre-existence is set forth existed long before; but there is a presumption against Justin's caring to know any of the apostle's writings. No clear proof of his having used them appears in his works.

Thophilus of Antioch in his treatise to Autolycus writes: 'He begat this emanated word, the first-born of every creature.'[3]

Marcion received the letter into his canon. It is also in the Muratorian list, and the old Latin and Syriac versions.

In modern times, the authenticity has been questioned on internal grounds, by Schrader, Mayerhoff,

[1] A quibus nos apostolus refrenans, nominatim philosophiam et inanem seductionem contestatus caveri opertere, scribens ad Colossenses: Videte ne quis sit circumveniens vos per philosophiam et inanem seductionem, secundum traditionem hominum; praeterprovidentiam Spiritus Sancti.—*De Praescript. Haeret.* vii. ed. Semler.

[2] *ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν πάντων ποιημάτων, πρωτότοκος μὲν τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πρὸ πάντων τῶν κτισμάτων, πρωτότοκος πάσης κτίσεως.—Dial. cum Tryph.* ed. Otto, pp. 286, 336, 452.

[3] *τοῦτον τὸν λόγον ἐγέννησε προφορικόν, πρωτότοκον πάσης κτίσεως.*—Lib. ii. p. 100, ed. Colon. 1686.

Schwegler, and Baur. It is useless to enter upon any formal refutation of Mayerhoff's posthumous treatise,[1] after the remarks made upon it by Huther, De Wette, and Meyer. The epistle to the Ephesians was not the basis, as he thinks; nor are the errors combated in it those of Cerinthus. If such injudiciousness be shown by Mayerhoff, an impartial conclusion need not be expected. He adduces a few points plausibly unpauline; the majority present critical one-sidedness, and will not bear scrutiny.

The opinion of Baur deserves more attention, supported as it is by all the acuteness and learning which mark the writings of this critic. A brief glance at his hypothesis must suffice.

Most of the observations relating to Baur's view of the Ephesian epistle apply here, because both epistles are treated together by that scholar, and from their similarity assigned to another than Paul. The arguments he adduces against the authenticity of the two are nearly identical; and therefore our remarks must partly anticipate later ones.

1. According to Baur, the epistle to the Colossians stands between the Pauline writings and fourth gospel, forming a bridge for the passing of certain ideas about Christ's person from a lower to a higher elevation. Its christology is the echo of Gnostic ideas. The Logos doctrine is introduced into Paulinism. The writer confronts the Ebionitism current throughout Asia Minor with a conciliatory tendency; or as Schwegler puts it more definitely, the epistle originated in the midst of the efforts which the church of Asia Minor was making towards unity, after primitive Ebionitism was overpowered by the help of incipient Gnosticism. Hence the christology propounded is metaphysical. In his authentic letters Paul does not dwell on the metaphysical

[1] Der Brief an die Colosser u. s. w. 1838.

nature of Christ as much as on the dignity and power of one exalted to the side of the Father. Christ's pre-existence is subsidiary with him. Here it is a *solid* and *central* dogma. He is the central being of the universe, in whom the oppositions of Judaism and heathenism are done away. Thus in i. 15-20, He is called *the image of the invisible God, the first-born of every creature*; in other words, He is the absolute origin of all created things. *All things were created by him and for him; he is before all things, and by him all things consist.* In the same passage his power is represented as extending to the invisible world as well as the visible, and is all-pervading. The explanation of this pre-eminence is sought in the system of the Gnostics, who attributed to a series of aeons what the author of the epistle concentrates in Christ. Like the *nus* or *monogenes* of the Gnostics, he manifests the occult nature of God. As the aeons came forth from God and return to the absolute principle, so Christ, according to the epistle, puts forth the efficacy of a peace-maker, to reconcile celestial and terrestrial things by his death (i. 20).

Some allowance should be made for diversity of time and circumstances. If an author has respect to different persons and influences, or if he intends to combat other errors, he will necessarily vary his arguments. In the larger epistles Paul had to wage war with Judaisers whose sentiments undermined the doctrine of justification by faith. The minor epistles indicate other hindrances to the gospel, more subjective than objective.

The extent of Christ's redemptive work, as stated in i. 20, is an idea that does not appear in Paul's authentic epistles. Thus much must be granted. It is, however, little more than an enlargement of his christology—an extension of the fundamental outlines of his doctrine to a point not reached before. Those outlines are shadowed forth in the epistle to the Romans, ix. 5; 1 Cor. viii. 6; 2 Cor. iv. 4; viii. 9; and the apostle

had only to develop them. The passage i. 15–20, is the fullest exposition of the Pauline christology, and may well contain new elements—the outcome of an admitted christology with which they are perfectly consistent. We may therefore believe, that the nature of the times and church required the pre-eminent dignity of Christ to be set forth more prominently, and unfolded with greater breadth. Why should that fact suggest a different author? Surely it is unreasonable to confine the apostle to one circle of ideas and expressions, without allowing for enlargement. A polemic reference to the errors noticed in the epistle appears to have called forth the peculiar ideas expressed respecting the higher dignity of Christ in his pre-existent state, his relation to the spirit-world, and his universal efficacy. Those errors were not *distinctively* Ebionite.

It is difficult to see how Christ can represent the aeons of the Gnostics. He reveals the Father; a series of aeons reveal the concealed God; that is all the similarity between them, which is slight in comparison with important differences. According to the epistle, Christ was sent by the Father to reveal the Divine will to the world and reconcile it to the Father, since it had become alienated through sin; according to the Valentinian system, a series of aeons, separate from the world, unfold the nature of the secret bythos or primal source of all, without having themselves any knowledge of the absolute. According to the one, the Son made the world; according to the other, the visible world proceeded from the demiurge, an aeon remote from the great Original, and sprung from wisdom or *achamoth*, who had wandered away from the pleroma, i.e. the fulness of the revealed Divine life. We might proceed to show that the resemblance between the Valentinian system, to which Baur has chief respect, and our epistle is less than their divergence. There is no reference in the latter to the bythos or primal essence, none to aeons,

none to sophia achamoth, or to the demiurge. Though nothing but the elements of Gnosticism had appeared in the circles of Christian influence whence the letter emerged, though no developed system existed, we cannot perceive what tangible relationship the epistle's christology bears to those incipient stages. The germs of Gnosticism must have assumed a definite state at the first, and possessed a few leading terms expressive of principles; why is the epistle without such distinctive words?

2. To ally the Christ of the epistle with the Gnostic aeons, Baur refers to the term *pleroma*, which was a leading one among these heretical speculators. According to the epistle, all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ; so far the author agrees with the Gnostics that there has been a full revelation of God. But there is dissimilarity in all other respects. In the epistle, God the Father, manifested by the Son, is not like the Gnostic bythos or pleroma—an abstract idea—but an absolute person. Christ is *the image* of the absolute God, but He is not Himself the pleroma—the pleroma or fulness of the Godhead dwells in Him. It is altogether unlike the Gnostic sentiment to say that the pleroma, represented among those heretics by an ideal series of aeons, is in a single man, Christ.

If Christ be compared with any one aeon, as with *nus* or *monogenes* the first self-manifestation of the hidden, there is little similarity between them; since the *monogenes* is removed as far as possible from the visible world.

3. Baur discovers an affinity between the christology of the Gnostics and that of the present epistle in the fact that Christ presides over angels who are divided into distinct classes, *thrones*, *dominions*, *principalities*, *and powers* (i. 16). Now Irenaeus, speaking of the paraclete of the Valentinians, states that all power was given him, sent down to wisdom or achamoth by Christ; so that

all things visible and invisible—in other words, *thrones*, *divinities*, *dominions*, were created in him.[1] We allow that the terms *thrones*, *dominions*, *principalities*, *and powers* mean angels in the Colossian epistle; but the Valentinians did not apply them to angels. According to them, thrones are distinguished from angels, and established by the paraclete; angels are attendants of the paraclete.

4. As to the words *aeon*, *sophia* or wisdom, *mystery*, *pleroma* or fulness, *gnosis* or knowledge, there is no proof that the sacred writer borrowed them from the Gnostic vocabulary; since their sense is not technical as among the Gnostics. It is much more likely that they were the representatives of ideas entertained prior to Paul. The doctrinal terms of the Gnostics rested on speculations older than Christianity. Gnosticism and the epistle may therefore have drawn from a common source—the vocabulary of pre-christian speculations. Or if this be deemed improbable, the language of the epistle may have been occasionally borrowed by the Gnostics. In any case, the distinctive words have different senses in Paulinism and Gnosticism. The pleroma of the Gnostics, which is the fulness of the Divine life revealed, or the collective aeons, is not the pleroma of this epistle. As to *gnosis*, its origin is explained in the christological representations of the false philosophy against which the apostle writes.

On the whole, we see no good grounds for tracing the peculiar ideas and terms in which Baur finds the reflection of a second century Gnosticism to any other source than Paul's own mind looking at the theosophic phenomena which affected the church at Colosse. He used or borrowed words as a suitable expression of his sentiments. Enlarging his former view of the person and efficacy of Christ, he took his readers into the in-

[1] θρόνοι, θεότητες, κυριότητες.—*Irenaeus contra Haeres.* i. 4, 5.

visible region of spirits or angels, to meet the speculations of the false teachers at Colosse. If they delighted to theorise about the derivation of the finite from the infinite, or intermediate beings whose contact with matter gave existence to our world; about the hidden Original of all individualising Himself in a series of celestial natures; the apostle became more metaphysical in describing the nature of Christ, in whom alone he recognises the image and revealer of God.

The theology of the epistle is similar to that of the fourth gospel. But it is rather preparatory to the Johannine doctrine than an exact parallel. The term *Word* is not applied to the Son, though the doctrine taught approaches that of the gospel's introduction. Christianity is the universal religion. It is opposed to the wisdom of men and all other religions; essentially independent, and rejecting everything that is not *after Christ* (ii. 8). Instead of being a higher form of Judaism, it must be separated from it. Here too, the antithesis of *faith* and the *law* does not appear, as in the larger Pauline epistles; while *love*, not merely as a single virtue, but as the *bond of perfection*, receives prominence, along with *good works* (i. 10). Emphasis is also laid upon *knowledge*, or *wisdom*. Such features are preparations for the Johannine doctrine, or steps leading directly to it. We cannot think that they are inconsistent with Paul, however characteristic of this epistle; because the same ideas lie in germ in his other writings. Why should it be thought incredible that external circumstances stimulated his mind, raising it to new aspects of the person of Christ? As he heard of the state of the believers at Colosse, and thought of the errors that imperilled their faith, might he not apprehend the gospel of Christ in a clearer form, and attain to a higher insight into the relations of the Son to the universe? His mind was not exempt from the law of growth.

More weight attaches to certain peculiarities of style

and diction than to selected ideas or sentiments, in showing that Paul himself was not the author.

The first two chapters, or rather the 1st and former half of the 2nd, have a stiff and broken style, without ease or freedom. The language moves along heavily, not in finished sentences or clauses connected by particles, but in a series of co-ordinate statements joined to one another by participial forms and relative pronouns, by causal or inferential conjunctions. ἄρα, ἄρα οὖν, διό, διότι, γὰρ are rare; though particles of that kind belong to the Pauline style, suiting his rapid argumentation. Compare ii. 9–15. Logical order is wanting in the doctrinal part; and the unsystematic succession of ideas is weakened by repetition, or labours under awkwardnesses of expression. The Pauline mode of writing is usually dialectic, hastening to a definite object in the shortest way, neglecting the grammatical construction, leaving anomalies, and overleaping intermediate ideas. Here it is loose and tautological, without spring or vivacity.

Besides, we meet with such peculiarities as the *Lord Christ* (iii. 24);[1] *Greek and Jew* for the Pauline *Jew and Greek*; φανερουῦν (iii. 4) applied to the second coming of Christ; ὅ ἐστιν (i. 24, 27) nearly equivalent to *videlicet*; and several new compounds.[2]

Taken separately, these phenomena are of slight weight in the unpauline scale; collectively, they challenge attention. The style of the 1st chapter and first half of the 2nd excites most suspicion, because it is so defective. Yet it is not necessary to resort to the hypothesis of another writer in this portion, as Ewald does, supposing that Timothy wrote the chief parts after receiving the matter

[1] ὁ κύριος Χριστός.

[2] As πιθανολογία, ἐθελοθρησκεία, αἰσχρολογία, προσηλοῦν, συλαγωγεῖν, χειρόγραφον, ἀνταναπληροῦν, εἰρηνοποιεῖν, κ.τ.λ. A list of the words peculiar to the epistle is given by Zeller, in the Tübingen Zeitschrift, vol. ii. pp. 506, 507.

of them from Paul, and that the latter took the pen into his own hand before the conclusion.[1] The varying moods of Paul's own mind, the fact that he does not reason or argue against the false teachers but unfolds gospel truth positively, may explain the phenomena in question. His temperament accounts for many diversities of thought and expression. He was never logical, or careful about style. Intent on far higher objects than good syntax or select words, he wrote rapidly, satisfied if the general meaning was tolerably clear.

The nature of the subject will account for the unusual and compound words only in part. Least of all are they due to an elevation or artificial elaboration of style in controversy. Neither a lofty nor a controversial subject caused them. The apostle's energies were not narrowed or cramped in their use. They are simply peculiarities of style, inferior to the apostle's ordinary mode of writing. Interpreters labour in vain, when trying to bring them into harmony with frames of mind or emotional feelings produced by the Spirit to suit the occasion. He was no more confined to certain mental states then, than he was in addressing other churches. No check to the sublimity of his flight was applied; nor can he be put in a lower realm of inspiration than the writer of the epistle to the Ephesians, without misjudging the genius of the letter. He possessed power and force, but it was not logical. The author of the Ephesian letter, with less power, has an easier style; less deep and recondite, his ideas are more expanded. The present epistle contains much more that is unmistakably Pauline than the reverse—Pauline in thought and diction—so that the careful student must not reject its authenticity because of phenomena which have an adverse aspect. If a preponderance of internal evidence bespeak Pauline authorship, as it unquestionably does, the unpauline

[1] Die Sendschreiben des Apostels Paulus, p. 469.

phenomena must give way. They may be left to the ingenuity of the reader without prejudice to the authenticity, because we are ignorant of a thousand circumstances connected with the apostle and his works. But that ingenuity must not run into absurd fancies about elevation or depression of style to suit the subject, about repression or enlargement of mind by the Spirit's action upon it, the necessary constraints of controversy, or artificial elaboration. Nothing can be more improbable than the application of a lofty or artificial elaboration of style to account for long, unusual compound words, or anything like artificiality in the Pauline writing. Style was an element that hardly entered into the apostle's consideration, as his thoughts flowed on in varied streams, rapid, passionate, condensed, heavy, struggling, loose.

NATURE OF THE ERRORS COMBATED BY THE APOSTLE, AND THOSE WHO DISSEMINATED THEM.

We assume that the heretical sentiments described belonged to the same persons, and were not distributed among different classes. The city of Colosse was comparatively small, and the Christians there not numerous. It is likely, therefore, that all the features belong to one portrait and unite in the same persons. The false teachers were also Christians, not Jews. They were Jewish Christians, i.e. Jews who had embraced Christianity. And they seem to have belonged to the church, while treated so tenderly by the apostle. No distinction is made between the chief promoters of the heretical sentiments which are condemned, and the body of the believers generally. The false leaven had spread, perhaps without having taken deep root or penetrated the church extensively. It was an incipient influence among the Colossian believers, which the apostle endeavours to

check, and warns them seriously against. This explains the fact, that he does not single out or speak of a party acting upon the church from without. The spiritual atmosphere of the Colossians, aided by their own mental idiosyncracy, led to their imbibing sentiments alien to a right christology and a practical Christian life. They could not retain the simplicity of the faith along with such opinions. Their angelology and asceticism corrupted the gospel. Hence the apostle would guard them against the danger they had incurred, by openly describing its nature and effects.

The tendency of the Colossian false teachers was decidedly Judaic. They held *the rudiments of the world*, i.e. the principles of the Mosaic law, the Jewish regulations respecting meats and drinks, festivals, new moons and sabbaths; and they observed circumcision. Hence the writer of the epistle exalts *spiritual* circumcision; reminding them that in Christ the distinctions between Jew and Gentile are done away, and *the mystery* of the gospel made known to all.

2. With such Judaic sentiments they combined a philosophy which partook of a mystic character. Their theosophy consisted in speculations about the world of spirits and the worship of angels. Perhaps they were curious about the genealogies of angels. Such speculations interfered with a right perception of Christ; since the theorists ranking him among the higher powers or angels, did not *hold the Head* (ii. 19). In opposition to this error, the author affirms that the whole fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ bodily; that he is the head and creator of the angel-world, and has the pre-eminence in all things.

3. As to the practical tendency of these false teachers, a strict asceticism prevailed among them. Such ascetic principles led them to reject marriage (ii. 21 *touch not*, an expression similarly applied in 1 Cor. vii. 1); and to the *docetic* view of Christ's person. Perhaps also, they

denied his resurrection (i. 18; ii. 12); though Olshausen and Meyer think otherwise.

These features, if referred to the same persons, may appear contradictory. The strict Judaists were averse to Gnostic speculation and false asceticism; while the Gnostic ascetics commonly disregarded the law as an external thing. But a little reflection shows their union in the same individuals. The errorists in question were Jewish Gnostics or theosophists who endeavoured to incorporate their particular views with the true gospel. Their Judaic sentiments were mainly of the Essene kind. In apostolic times theosophical and ascetic opinions, which had not yet assumed a definite shape, were diffused among Jews and Gentiles; and it is easy to see how different tendencies might coalesce with Christianity. The subsequent appearance of Cerinthus and the Gnostic Ebionites shows how a theosophic, ascetic tendency could associate itself with the legal bias of Judaism. In fact, these heretics were the incipient advocates of that Jewish-christian gnosis which Cerinthus afterwards advocated at Ephesus, not far from Phrygia. It is not necessary to travel much beyond the bounds of Judaism as it existed in the time of Christ outside Palestine, for an explanation of the views of these theosophic Christians; since that system had incorporated within itself elements of oriental and heathen origin. The Jews dispersed throughout Asia Minor were strongly tinged with foreign influences. Christian beliefs in those regions were affected by them. But indeed the national character of the Phrygians was tinctured with a mystical enthusiasm. Such propensity turned in a heathen direction may be observed in the fanatical worship of Cybele; in the direction of Christianity, it appears in the Montanism of the second century. The Phrygians were prone to speculations respecting the invisible world.

In consequence of the various mental tendencies

prevalent in Asia Minor when the epistle was written, it is difficult, if not impossible, to draw a definite picture of the false teachers among the Colossians. Jews by birth, they had received a Jewish education, and had also imbibed heathen ideas, because Judaism had absorbed oriental elements. Their theosophy was of mixed origin; their creed neither consistent nor compact, though it seemed to them capable of being incorporated with Christianity. Speculative rather than practical, they had departed from the simplicity of the gospel.

We do not call the tendency of these Colossian Christians *Cerinthian*, because the epistle was prior to the time of Cerinthus. Most of their peculiarities were afterwards embodied in the system of that heretic. Neither do we call it *Ebionite-Gnostic*, because Gnosticism had not been consolidated so early. Doubtless the seeds of Ebionite Gnosticism entered into the views of the parties. It is important, however, not to confound the floating elements out of which definite systems of belief were formed with the systems themselves.

OCCASION AND OBJECT OF WRITING.

The intelligence which Epaphras brought the writer respecting the affairs of the Christians at Colosse, was the immediate occasion of the epistle. Onesimus was returning with a letter to his master Philemon, and Tychicus accompanied him, bearing the epistle to the Colossians.

The *object* of the letter is clearly seen from the contents. Though the state of the believers had been satisfactory on the whole, and the apostle had reason for thankfulness as he beheld their order and the steadfastness of their faith, there was cause for anxiety. They were exposed to peculiar temptations, liable to be beguiled by the enticing words of false teachers. Some had been carried away, and were about to make ship-

wreck of the faith. The apostle designed to warn his readers against the erroneous tenets of certain errorists who corrupted the gospel, as well as to establish them in the Christian life. Threatened as the Colossians were with the dangers of heretical sentiments current in Asia Minor, the apostle was anxious to keep their minds free from contagion. His design was both polemic and didactic. Specific circumstances shaped the contents of the letter.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The epistle was written at Rome during the apostle's imprisonment, A.D. 62. Those who advocate Caesarea as the place, and therefore an earlier date, are less correct in their view. The words of iv. 3, 11, agree better with Rome, where the writer had opportunities of promoting the kingdom of God, if Acts xxviii. 31 be reliable. He had not so much freedom at Caesarea, where there was little scope for fellow-workers (iv. 11). The passage iv. 3, will agree with either locality; but we believe that it does not refer so much to a *future* time of enlargement, as to that of his imprisonment itself—'that God may open to us a door of utterance,' in our bonds, and in spite of them.

Again, in Philemon 22, the apostle expresses the hope of journeying to Phrygia, which he might do at Rome, but not at Caesarea, since he intended in the latter place to go to Rome; while the words of Acts xx. 25 show that he had no idea of returning to Asia Minor. If it be said, that he might have purposed after Acts xx. 25, to return to Asia, in Caesarea as well as in Rome, it is a mere conjecture. The apostle's sojourn at Caesarea generally, appears to indicate his settled desire to go to Rome forthwith. The twenty-second verse of Philemon expresses nothing more than a faint hope of seeing him again—a hope more natural to Paul's mind

at Rome than Caesarea, because at the latter place he was bent on appealing to Caesar in person and having his case settled, before he should undertake another missionary tour.

Holtzmann attaches importance to the fact that Colosse was partially destroyed by an earthquake, about the time when this letter was written. Tacitus states that the neighbouring Laodicea was so destroyed in the seventh year of Nero, i.e. A.D. 61. According to Eusebius. the earthquake affected Hierapolis and Colosse, as well as Laodicea. But he dates it in the tenth of Nero. Paul Orosius again, puts it in the fourteenth of his reign. These notices are too uncertain to build upon. Tacitus says nothing about Colosse being destroyed; and Eusebius who does, places the earthquake after the writing of the letter. Even if Tacitus's account be trustworthy and Colosse suffered along with Laodicea, Paul may have known nothing of it in his captivity. All that Wiggers, Meyer, and Holtzmann urge in favour of Caesarea is insufficient to set aside De Wette's pertinent observations in favour of Rome.

Whatever plausibility there be in the arguments which some urge for Caesarea, it is still more probable that the epistles to the Colossians and Philemon were written from Rome. The most judicious advocates of Caesarea are constrained to except the Philippian letter, which they allow to have been written at Rome; without showing any cogent consideration for its separation from those written in a similar captivity.

CONTENTS.

The epistle may be divided into two parts: the first chiefly doctrinal, the latter practical; chapters i. ii., and iii. iv.

After the salutation, the apostle expresses his thanks to God for the faith and love of the Colossian believers,

and his unceasing prayer on their behalf, that they might be filled with the knowledge of the Divine will in all wisdom and spiritual understanding, so as to walk worthy of the Lord and well pleasing in his sight; abounding in good deeds, for which they were strengthened by the power of God working in them. He again expresses his thanks to God the Father, who had prepared him and the Colossians for the heavenly inheritance, since they had been delivered from the kingdom of ignorance, and translated into the spiritual kingdom of the Son, through whose blood alone complete redemption is obtained. The mention of Christ and his atonement leads to a description of his person and dignity. He is the image of the invisible God, the first-born of all creation, the upholder of all beings and things in the universe, the head of the church, the first-begotten of the dead, having pre-eminence over spiritual intelligences and renewed humanity. As lord over all, he is said to have reconciled all things and the Colossians also divested of their former enmity, that if they continued steadfast in the faith they might be presented faultless in the immediate presence of the Almighty (i. 1–23).

The writer expresses his joy in the office he had been called to, notwithstanding all his sufferings, because these very sufferings tended to promote the progress and subserve the completeness of the universal Church. In discharging the duties of his ministry, he states that he had to preach the gospel fully, to instruct and warn all men both Jews and Gentiles, and to present every one perfect in Christ. For this he laboured earnestly, especially for the believers at Colosse and as many as had not seen his face. He entertained for them great solicitude, that they might be established and knit together in love, being fully assured of the mystery of God—the Divine purpose of blessing mankind in that Saviour who possesses in Himself all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge. He then proceeds to warn

them against a deceitful philosophy grounded on human authority, and not derived from Christ. In opposition to it, he reminds them that all the fulness of the Godhead dwelt in Christ bodily; and that they themselves had been spiritually quickened by his grace, having been delivered from the yoke of legal observances. Hence they should not be seduced from the gospel by a pretended wisdom which affected intercourse with angels and spirits, enjoined ceremonial observances, abstinence from meats and drinks, and an ascetic neglect of the body (i. 24–ii. 23).

He now passes to general precepts, in which the readers are exhorted to be heavenly-minded, to withdraw their affections from sinful objects, to crucify the lusts of the flesh, to lay aside such practices as they had once indulged in, and to be furnished with the virtues of a renewed nature. They are admonished above all, to have the love and peace of God ruling in their hearts, to edify one another in their mutual intercourse, giving thanks at all times to God the Father who had created them anew (iii. 1–17). Various directions relating to domestic life are subjoined, such as the duties of husbands and wives, parents and children, servants and masters; followed by an exhortation to continued prayer combined with watchfulness; prayer in particular for the author's release, that he might be at full liberty to preach the gospel. For information about his affairs he refers them to Tychicus the bearer of the letter; and to Onesimus, of whom he speaks with affection. The closing verses contain salutations to various individuals, and an injunction to have the present epistle read before the Laodicean church, while the epistle sent to Laodicea should also be read in the church at Colosse. The apostle concludes by subscribing the letter with his own hand, and impressing it with the seal of authenticity (iii. 18–iv. 18).

THE EPISTLE FROM LAODICEA.

In iv. 16 it is written, 'And when this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; *and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea.*'

Two views have been entertained of the last clause: first, that an epistle written at, and sent from Laodicea is meant. Second, that an epistle sent to the Laodiceans by Paul is intended.

1. The preposition *from*[1] is urged as pointing to the source of the letter. But it is not decisive. The verb *cause*[2] in the context favours another opinion, viz. that the Colossians were *to procure* it *from* Laodicea, not that it had been composed there. Why should it be recommended to the Colossians to read a letter of Laodicean origin addressed to Paul, when they had received Paul's to them, in which he would probably embody whatever was necessary?

2. The only tenable interpretation is, that the words refer to an epistle written by Paul to Laodicea, and sent thence to the Colossians. According to the author's injunction, a letter addressed to the Colossians was to be read in the church of the Laodiceans; a letter addressed to the Laodiceans was to be forwarded by them to the Colossians.

The epistle in question has been lost. One is extant in the Latin language, purporting to be the Laodicean, which Elias Hutter translated into Greek. It is plainly a forgery, consisting of passages taken from the Pauline letters, especially that to the Philippians. Anger has edited it most correctly;[3] and Dr. Eadie gives an English version of it.[4]

[1] ἐκ. [2] ποιήσατε.

[3] Ueber den Laodicenerbrief, 1843.

[4] Commentary on the Greek text of the Epistle of Paul to the Colossians, p. 299, *et seq.*

It is useless to discuss the opinions of those who identify the Laodicean with an extant canonical epistle: either with the epistle to the Hebrews, as Schulthess does; or with that to Philemon, as Wieseler argues; or with that to the Ephesians, according to Anger. The reasons adduced for these views are not sufficient to give them plausibility.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1847; Meyer, 1865; Bleek, 1865; Dalmer, 1838; Huther, 1841; Steiger, 1835; Olshausen, 1840; and Ewald, 1857.

THE EPISTLE TO THE PHILIPPIANS.

SOME CIRCUMSTANCES CONNECTED WITH PHILIPPI.

PHILIPPI belonged originally to Thrace, but was afterwards reckoned to Macedonia. According to Diodorus Siculus it was formerly called Crenides, from numerous springs in its vicinity. It was situated on a rising ground about nine miles inland, north-west of its harbour Neapolis. Philip, perceiving the importance of the situation, repaired and enlarged the town, fortifying it against the incursions of the Thracians. From him it was called Philippi (B.C. 358). The battles fought near it are remarkable in history, especially the second, with which its name is chiefly identified.

The writer of the Acts notices it thus: 'the chief city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony,' words whose meaning has given rise to considerable diversity of opinion. When Paulus Aemilius conquered Perseus, he divided Macedonia into four parts or regions; to the first of which Philippi was assigned, but Amphipolis was the capital. The most natural interpretation is, 'the first city of that part of Macedonia, and a colony,' i.e. the first Macedonian city at which one coming from proconsular Asia would arrive, Neapolis belonging to Thrace, not Macedonia. Thus the adjective *first* respects *locality*. Many refer it to *rank*, translating 'the *chief* city of that part of Macedonia.'

The apostle Paul visited Philippi on his second mis-

sionary journey, accompanied by Silas, Timothy, and Luke; and preached in a Jewish *proseucha* or temporary place of worship; for there was no synagogue. But he suffered severe treatment at the hands of the selfish heathen, and the magistrates of the place, by whom he was imprisoned. After a short stay he left the city (Acts xvi). During his absence, Luke, Timothy, Epaphroditus, and perhaps Clement, laboured to advance the work, by enlarging and strengthening the church he had founded. He visited it again on his third missionary tour. Whether he visited the place when passing through Macedonia on his way to Greece, accompanied by Tychicus and Trophimus, is more than doubtful; though some suppose that he even wrote there, at that time, the second epistle to the Corinthians. None but two visits can be made out with certainty (Acts xx.).

Philippi was the first European town that received the gospel, the standard of divine truth being planted where contending armies had met. While historians of Rome will point to Philippi as the scene of a memorable struggle, and lament over the fallen Brutus the stern defender of his country's freedom; religious historians will prefer to speak of a spiritual victory achieved by Christianity. Brutus and Cassius, Augustus and Antony, vanish from the view of enlightened patriotism before Paul and Silas, Luke and Epaphroditus,—victors nobler far than blood-stained Romans at the head of armies.

AUTHENTICITY.

External testimonies in favour of the Pauline authorship are abundant and unanimous. Thus Polycarp writes to the Philippians: 'For neither I nor any one like me, can reach the wisdom of the blessed and glorious Paul . . . . who also, when absent, wrote to

you letters, into which if ye look ye will be able to edify yourselves in the faith which has been given you.'[1]

Again: 'But I have neither perceived nor heard any such thing in you, among whom the blessed Paul laboured, who are [praised] in the beginning of his epistle. For he glories in you in all the churches which alone knew God then.'[2]

Irenaeus says: 'As Paul also says to the Philippians: "I am full, having received of Epaphroditus the things which were sent from you, an odour of a sweet smell, a sacrifice acceptable, well-pleasing to God."'[3]

The following occurs in Clement of Alexandria: 'When Paul confesses of himself, "Not as though I had already attained, either were already perfect,"' &c.[4]

Tertullian writes: 'Of which (hope) being in suspense himself, when he writes to the Philippians, "If by any means," says he, "I might attain to the resurrection of the dead: not as though I had already attained, or were perfected."'[5]

In the epistle of the churches of Vienne and Lyons, given by Eusebius, the following quotation occurs from the second chapter: 'who also were so far followers and imitators of Christ, "Who being in the form of

[1] Οὔτε γὰρ ἐγώ, οὔτε ἄλλος ὅμοιος ἐμοὶ δύναται κατακολουθῆσαι τῇ σοφίᾳ τοῦ μακαρίου καὶ ἐνδόξου Παύλου, ὃς καὶ ἀπὼν ὑμῖν ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὰς εἰς ἃς ἐὰν ἐγκύπτητε, δυνηθήσεσθε οἰκοδομεῖσθαι εἰς τὴν δοθεῖσαν ὑμῖν πίστιν, κ.τ.λ.—*Ep. ad Philipp.* c. iii. p. 118, ed. Hefele, 1842.

[2] Ego autem nihil tale sensi in vobis, vel audivi, in quibus laboravit beatus Paulus, qui estis [laudati] in principio epistolae ejus. De vobis etenim gloriatur in omnibus ecclesiis, quae Deum solae tunc cognoverant.—*Ibid.* c. xi.

[3] Quemadmodum et Paulus Philippensibus ait: Repletus sum, acceptis ab Epaphrodito quae a vobis missa sunt, odorem suavitatis, hostiam acceptabilem, placentem Deo.—*Adv. Haeres.* iv. 34, p. 326, ed. Grabe.

[4] Αὐτοῦ ὁμολογοῦντος τοῦ Παύλου περὶ ἑαυτοῦ· Οὐχ' ὅτι ἤδη ἔλαβον, κ.τ.λ.—*Paedagog.* lib. i. p. 107, D. See also *Stromata*, iv. p. 511 A.

[5] Ad quam (justitiam) pendens et ipse, quum Philippensibus scribit, si qua, inquit, concurram in resurrectionem quae est a mortuis; non quia jam accepi, aut consummatus sum.—*De Resurrect. Carnis*, c. xxiii.

God, thought it no robbery to be equal with God,"' &c.[1]

In modern times the authenticity has been questioned. Schrader took exception to iii. 1–iv. 9. Baur and Schwegler rejected the Pauline authorship of the whole, without gaining many followers; for De Wette, Schenkel, and Reuss, not to mention others, have defended it in opposition to the Tübingen leaders.

Let us glance at Baur's arguments.

1. The epistle moves in the circle of Gnostic ideas and expressions, which it appropriates and adopts with the necessary modification. This is specially observable in the obscure passage, ii. 5–8: 'Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus; who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God; but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of man; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.' The sixth verse is so peculiar, that the critic thinks it intelligible solely on the supposition that the writer had the Gnostic doctrine before his eyes, according to which Sophia the last of the aeons, moved by the intensity of its desires to know the absolute One, attempted to get hold of that knowledge but failed, and fell from the *pleroma* into emptiness or *kenoma*. What Sophia thus wished to obtain, is tantamount to the *being equal with God*—an act of violence contrary to its nature, and a crime against the absolute Father. This is applied to Christ, of whom it is said that he did not act like Sophia.

Here much depends on the true explanation of a passage confessedly difficult. It would be out of place to enter at length on its discussion and canvass the dif-

[1] Οἱ καὶ ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον ζηλωταὶ καὶ μιμηταὶ Χριστοῦ ἐγένοντο, ὃς ἐν μορφῇ Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων οὐχ' ἁρπαγμὸν ἡγήσατο τὸ εἶναι ἴσα Θεῷ.—Ap. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* v. 2.

ferent views taken of it, pointing out their merits or defects. Baur [1] and Ernesti [2] have gone fully into the subject; Lünemann, Brückner, Tholuck, Raebiger, and Meyer have tried to elucidate it. All that we can do is to intimate our opinion in the shortest way. The two things 'being in the form of God,' and 'being equal with God,' are not essentially, but only formally different. Here we dissent from Lünemann, Brückner, and Raebiger. The one is the form of the pre-existent Logos partaking of the glory of the Father; the other is the essential state of the same Logos, irrespective of form or manifestation. Neither implies perfect equality with the Father, for the subordination of the Son pervades the New Testament including the fourth gospel; and *homoousianism* or consubstantiality is a later doctrine; but *homoiousianism*, i.e. similarity of substance or essence, is predicated of Christ both here and elsewhere.

The writer's view is this: Christ is what he is in himself absolutely; and yet he must *become* what he should be according to the idea of his person. Why should he have assumed human nature, have died and risen again, if this had no result for himself? On the one hand, he is all in himself already; on the other, he must become what he is not yet. The two things can only be united in his becoming what he is not; by divesting or emptying himself in order to receive back what he had laid aside with the full realisation of the idea. Such is the doctrine of the passage. Christ is in himself a being of a divine nature—he is 'in the form of God,' but he lays that aside, assumes 'the form of a servant,' and is in consequence exalted to be an object of universal worship. Thus his person is looked at in a moral point of view.

[1] Theologische Jahrbücher for 1849, p. 504, &c.; and for 1852, p. 133, &c.

[2] Studien und Kritiken for 1848, p. 858, &c.; and for 1851, p. 595, &c.

The divine dignity he has in Himself, must be the result for him of his own moral action. He lays it aside to receive it back the more gloriously as the reward of his obedience. Where then is there room for the idea of *robbery*? If what he is in himself, becomes nothing more than an actual reality to him—if the *being in the form of God* simply becomes *being equal with God* after he has exercised his nature in the way of moral effort and obedience, how can *robbery* be asserted or denied in the case? The word so rendered,[1] refers to an abrupt seizure or anticipation of a thing, before the time ordained by God. He did not hastily and greedily appropriate to himself what he could only obtain in a definite way, by fulfilling a series of conditions attached. He became what he is essentially, by a definite moral process. Moral effort regularly gone through in all its legitimate steps according to the purpose of God, enabled him to realise what he is in himself—his equality with God. Lünemann and others, who suppose the two expressions *being in the form of God* and *being equal with God* to be essentially distinct, explaining the words that although Christ was in a divine form, he did not wish to have *lordship* in himself as God has, are incorrect; because according to that idea, a higher dignity was withheld from the Word in his pre-existent state, which he reached as the Word incarnate.

The peculiarities of this Philippian christology are the idea expressed by *robbery*, or the act of appropriating beforehand what could not be legitimately acquired so soon, and the ethical aspect of Christ's person. But it is surely far-fetched to find a parallel to the *robbery* in the act ascribed to the aeon Sophia. That aeon is not the type of Christ, but the first Adam in whom the opposite of what is ascribed to Christ was exemplified. The words translated *made himself of no reputation* or

[1] ἁρπαγμός.

literally *emptied himself*, find a parallel in the *became poor* of 2 Cor. viii. 9; while the *rich* is synonymous with our expression, *being in the form of God*. What is new we may well ascribe to the apostle's own mind, whose thoughts expanded according to the occasion and subject. Here he wanted to set forth Christ's example as one of condescension and self-abnegation; an example of the highest moral effort and noblest obedience, through humiliation and ignominy. Hence the ethical aspect in which Christ's person is viewed. The words *form*, *likeness*, *fashion*, *being found*[1] when properly understood, are not docetic; and the whole passage, so far as it relates to the divine nature and pre-existence of Christ, harmonises with the Pauline doctrine in 2 Cor. viii. 9. The *form* of God is equivalent to the *image* of God in 2 Cor. iv. 4; and 'made in the *likeness* of men,' shows that he entered with men into their condition. Baur is right in saying that 'in the likeness of men,' is not parallel to 'in the likeness of sinful flesh' (Rom. viii. 3). The Philippian writer speaks of the divine and human *form* of existence; not of Christ's laying aside the divine nature and assuming the human. Christ becomes man but does not give up the identity of his divine nature. The likeness is extended to humanity at large, and is not confined to the Son, else the phraseology would have been, 'in the likeness of sinful flesh.' The tenth and eleventh verses of the 2nd chapter are also pronounced Gnostic; but their meaning agrees with that of. Rom. viii. 34; xiv. 9; 1 Cor. xv. 24–26. The idea of *hades*, which lies in the last of the three categories (heavenly, earthly, subterranean beings), is not specifically Gnostic, but belongs to the New Testament (Luke xxiii. 43, &c.).

2. Baur alludes to the monotonous repetition of things

[1] μορφή, ὁμοίωμα, σχῆμα, εὑρεθείς.

already said; and a certain poverty of thought the consciousness of which the author himself expresses by saying, '*to write the same things to you*, to me indeed is not grievous, but for you it is safe.' This rests on a false interpretation. The apostle does not refer to things already said in the epistle, but either to a former letter he had addressed to them, or to what he told them when present.

3. The epistle wants a definite object and character. This can hardly be, when Judaisers are alluded to, though it must be allowed, incidentally. It contains indeed less speciality than other letters; but it is not difficult to perceive an object which the writer had in view. If such object be general, it corresponds better to the nature of an affectionate letter prompted by the receipt of a gift from the Philippians.

4. The same critic takes offence at what is stated about the progress of the gospel in i. 12; iv. 22, the key to which, as he thinks, is found in iv. 3, where Clement of Rome is mentioned, who was a relation of Domitian's, and made into a friend of Tiberius's by the Christians. Clement had to be glorified as a fellow-labourer with Paul, and connected with Caesar's household. The great advance of the gospel in Rome was associated with this person. But the Clement of the epistle is a Philippian Christian; and has nothing to do with the fabulous Roman one. Hence, the Petrine Clement does not appear here as a Pauline Christian, showing a tendency in the unknown writer to conciliate the Pauline and Petrine Christians. In like manner the women at variance, Euodia and Syntyche, are said to represent mystically *parties* rather than *persons*; while *the true yoke-fellow* (iv. 3), is the apostle Peter, the syzygy of Paul. Surely this is too ingenious to be adopted by any but determined advocates of the unpauline authorship.

5. Unpauline particulars are said to appear in the epithet *dogs* (iii. 2), who however are elsewhere called *false apostles*, *deceitful workers*, and *Satan* himself (2 Cor. xi. 13, 14). *The concision* (iii. 2), is explained by the *excision* referred to in Gal. v. 12. The apostle, we allow, speaks severely of the Jewish Christians; but he had already uttered as hard words of similar persons in the second epistle to the Corinthians, ii. 17 (chapters x.–xiii.), as well as in that to the Galatians. His tone becomes calmer and more moderate after iii. 2, with the exception of iii. 19, till he leaves the subject at iv. 1. Nor do the gifts alluded to in iv. 15–18, excite suspicion as if they were meant to support a fictitious situation of the apostle. When Baur says that they disagree with 1 Cor. ix. 15, and are derived from 2 Cor. xi. 9, he neglects to see that Paul himself, in the latter passage, allows that he took contributions from other churches.

These few remarks must suffice as a reason for withholding assent from the ingenious view propounded by Baur and Schwegler. Only those who are not real critics themselves or dogmatise in orthodox mood, will venture to speak of Baur's dissertation on the epistle as the insanity of hypercriticism. Few critics are insane after the same fashion; none certainly who fling epithets against one that has left the abiding mark of his intellect on the criticism of the New Testament.

UNITY.

Stephen Le Moyne[1] supposed that the Philippian epistle was divided into two, which were written on different rolls. The one, being separated into two parts, was reckoned two. By this expedient he explains the plural *letters* in the third chapter of Polycarp's epistle.

[1] Varia Sacra, vol. ii. p. 332, &c.

Heinrichs[1] thought that the epistle is composed of two letters—one addressed to the whole church, consisting of i. 1–iii. 1, ending with 'in the Lord,' together with iv. 21–23; the other, intended for the apostle's intimate friends only, beginning with, 'To write these same things,' iii. 1, and ending with iv. 20. When the New Testament epistles were collected, the two are said to have received their present form and place. The same opinion, modified and corrected, was advanced by Paulus (1805). It is a hypothesis that rests on no foundation.[2] A similar conjecture has been hazarded by Weisse, with as little probability. The words, 'finally, my brethren, rejoice in the Lord,' appear to indicate a speedy termination, as the analogy of 2 Cor. xiii. 11; Ephes. vi. 10; 2 Thess. iii. 1, shows. Not that the verb *rejoice*[3] is necessarily valedictory, meaning *farewell;* but that the adverbial expression rendered *finally* implies a brief summing up of all that the author wishes to add. In 1 Thess. iv. 1, the same formula stands at a considerable distance from the end of the epistle, as if it belonged to the close of an important topic, *wherever* such topic is concluded. Perhaps the apostle's original intention was to finish at iii. 1; but when Epaphroditus did not set out immediately, or additional information of the Judaisers was received, the author was moved to add a warning against the corrupters of the truth.

NUMBER OF PHILIPPIAN EPISTLES.

Bleek and others think that the apostle wrote more than once to the Philippians, deducing that opinion from a few passages in the present letter. In iii. 18, 'For many walk, of whom I have told you often,' i.e. in a former epistle. But the language may also refer to

[1] In the prolegomena to his Commentary, published in 1803.
[2] See Krause's Opuscula, pp. 3–32.
[3] Χαίρετε.

oral communications, as De Wette inclines to believe. Again, 'To write the same things to you' (iii. 1), probably means, 'the same things which I told you in a prior letter.' But it is capable of the sense, 'the same things which I previously taught when present.' The testimony of Polycarp has been adduced to strengthen the interpretation which supposes a former letter. In the third chapter of his epistle to the Philippians, that father speaks of Paul's 'epistles' to them. But the plural may be used for the singular; and the use of the singular in the eleventh chapter of Polycarp may neutralise the plural of the third chapter. Yet the singular *may* refer to the *more prominent* of the epistles, i.e. the canonical one. Thus these passages afford nothing more than a presumption in favour of several epistles. They do not prove that Paul wrote more than one. Meyer attaches more weight to them than they have.

TIME AND PLACE.

It is obvious that the present epistle was written during the same captivity and at the same place with that to the Colossians, in other words at Rome, A.D. 62 or 63. The expression, 'Caesar's household' (iv. 22), is pretty clear in favour of Rome. Herod could scarcely be called Caesar. Had Caesarea been meant, we should expect another phraseology. But the word *palace* or *praetorium* (i. 13), is referred to Caesarea by Böttger,[1] since it is used of Herod's palace there, and is also applied to the residence belonging to the procurator of a Roman province (Matt. xxvii. 27; Mark xv. 16; John xviii. 28–33, xix. 9). Here, however, it means *the camp* or *quarters* of the praetorian cohorts at Rome, who formed the imperial body-guard. Paul, or at least

[1] Beiträge zur historisch-kritischen Einleit. in die paulinische Briefe, Abtheilung 2, p. 47, *et seq.*

his fellow-prisoners, were delivered to the prefect of these cohorts. It has also been alleged, that Acts xxiii. 35 compared with xxviii. 16 shows Paul to have been kept in the *praetorium* at Caesarea, whereas in Rome he had his own hired house, and therefore the *praetorium* points to Caesarea. But the epistle merely asserts that his imprisonment in the cause of Christ was well known in all the praetorium, not that he resided in it.

It remains to show that the letter was written after those to the Colossians and Philemon, when the time of imprisonment was near its end. A considerable period is supposed to have elapsed since his incarceration, so that the good fruit of his ministry had become apparent (i. 12–14): 'But I would ye should understand, brethren, that the things which happened unto me have fallen out rather unto the furtherance of the gospel; so that my bonds in Christ are manifest in all the palace, and in all other places; and many of the brethren in the Lord, waxing confident by my bonds, are much more bold to speak the word without fear.' We know too from ii. 26, that Epaphroditus's coming was not very recent. Four journeys in which he was concerned had taken place: his own arrival and return, with the report of his sickness conveyed to Philippi and back again to Rome. It would also appear that the apostle was almost alone. His friends had gone away, or been sent to different places, except Timothy. Even Luke seems to have been absent (i. 1; ii. 20, 21; iv. 22, compared with Coloss. iv. 14). In these circumstances, the apostle himself was not without hope of a speedy release. 'But I trust in the Lord, that I also myself shall come shortly' (ii. 24). 'And having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith, that your rejoicing may be more abundant in Jesus Christ for me, by my coming to you again' (i. 25, 26). This hopeful

language, however, is not uniform. Doubts mingled with trust, and therefore he writes, 'According to my earnest expectation and hope, that in nothing I shall be ashamed, but that with all boldness, as always, so now also, Christ shall be magnified in my body, whether it be by life or by death. Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy and rejoice with you all (i. 20; ii. 17).

It is impossible to find in the epistle indications of any alteration for the worse in the prisoner's outward condition. The *contest* referred to in i. 30 is the opposition he encountered at Rome from the Jewish Christians—opposition from which he was never exempt where those believers were. The *first sorrow* implied in ii. 27 can only be his captivity generally. Such as seek for an intensification of his captivity, or a change in his circumstances, in these passages, seek for what is not in them. The history of Nero's government also, fails to prove a deterioration in Paul's situation. What though Burrus, the moderate praetorian prefect, died, and Tigellinus came into his place; though Octavia were divorced, and Poppaea married to the emperor; though Seneca lost his influence? These public events would hardly affect a prisoner like Paul, of whom courtiers and generals, senators and empresses, would scarcely think. It is therefore a mere conjecture, that after Burrus's death Paul was treated more severely, being removed from his house, put into the barrack of the praetorian guards, and threatened with death. Neither the present epistle nor the history of the time, countenances it. We admit that a tone of sadness appears in the letter; but that tone is mingled with hopefulness. Do not these words, 'having this confidence, I know that I shall abide and continue with you all for your furtherance and joy of faith' (i. 25), express the hope of a speedy release? The epistle may be dated near the end of the Roman captivity, and shortly before the

writer's death. It is his testament—the last letter he wrote. For this reason a melancholy interest attaches to it. Soon after his hopes and fears of the future had found utterance, the latter were realised, and a sacrifice offered—the noblest, after that of the Master, which the world has witnessed.

The epistle was sent by Epaphroditus, perhaps one of the elders of the church, who had come to Rome with a pecuniary contribution. It was not the first occasion on which the same church had expressed its gratitude in a similar way. The members had sent presents to the apostle twice before (Phil. iv. 15, 16). He had also partaken of their bounty at Corinth (2 Cor. xi. 9), though he declined to accept eleemosynary help from other churches. The Philippian messenger was seized with a dangerous illness, which may have arisen from the fatigue of his journey, or from his exertions at Rome in connection with evangelical work; and the news of his malady had reached the church at Philippi, which made him very anxious to return. The apostle himself was desirous to send him back as soon as he had recovered, that the regrets of pastor and people might be removed. He was not dismissed, however, without an equivalent for their seasonable present. In return for so great kindness, Paul wrote the present letter to the believers at Philippi, full of ardent affection, showing the high esteem with which their messenger was regarded.

But how could the apostle be in want at the time he was relieved by the Philippians? Was he neglected by the Christians at Rome? It is sufficient, in reply, to refer to his known practice, one dictated by extreme delicacy and dignity. He worked with his hands rather than be a burden to the churches. This he could not do, now that he was a prisoner. The Romans had not been his converts, and he would therefore regard himself as not entitled to maintenance from them. He had also ene-

mies in the city, who would ascribe interested motives to him. These considerations explain his poverty.

STATE OF THE CHURCH.

The Philippian church consisted of Gentile and Jewish Christians, almost entirely of the former; and the members generally were not in affluent circumstances. That they were not numerous may be also inferred from the extent of the place. Philippi was the smallest city to which the apostle addressed a letter; and therefore the church was neither large nor flourishing.

Some critics have supposed that the Christian society was divided into parties or factions, arising from the efforts of false teachers insisting on the necessity of circumcision. Judaising Christians, it is thought, had insinuated themselves into it, sowing the seeds of disunion. There were two parties, a Jewish Christian and a Gentile Christian one. The passages appealed to for the existence of parties are iii. 1–8, 18, 19; and the admonitions in ii. 2–4, 12, 14; iv. 2, 5; iii. 2, &c., are supposed to intimate the same state. These are an insufficient foundation for the hypothesis. The 16th chapter of the Acts shows that there were Jews there, for they had a *proseucha*; and the warning in iii. 2, 3 implies the presence of Judaising brethren; but there is no evidence that the latter had made an impression on the church, or undermined the apostle's authority and doctrine. Paul applies a severe name to the Jewish Christians, *dogs*, who perhaps had attempted to seduce some of the brethren; he describes them as 'enemies of the cross of Christ,' more immoral than heretical; but the Philippians were too steadfast to surrender themselves an easy prey. Though he had often warned them of danger, it does not appear from the epistle that they had so far forgotten his principles as to submit to legal observances, or range themselves into factions.

The existence of parties in the church has been disproved by Schulz,[1] so that it is hardly necessary to do more than allude to the subject. How then were the Christians there exposed to sufferings and persecution, as we learn from i. 28–30? Were the adversaries of whom the writer tells them not to be afraid, Judaising teachers? The succeeding context is unfavourable to this opinion. By the *adversaries* is meant all the unbelieving Jews and Gentiles with whom the Philippian converts came into contact—the Jews and Gentiles who resisted the gospel. These Christians had endured a conflict similar to that which Paul had formerly sustained for expelling the demon from the divining damsel, and to his present opposition from Jews, Judaising teachers, and heathen magistrates. But the Philippians resisted their adversaries, and steadfastly adhered to the Pauline doctrine.

There was a tendency in the Philippian character to vain glory and pride, as we infer from ii. 3, 4, 15; iv. 5. Their very condition when the apostle addressed them, one of great promise and progress, would be likely to beget spiritual pride. Such is the weakness of humanity, that the highest spirituality approaches the verge of superciliousness and vain glory.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

Epaphroditus's return gave rise to the letter. The object of it is to confirm the believers in the faith, and to encourage them in the Christian life. The writer's affection for them is conspicuous; every part breathing tenderness. He opens his heart as one on terms of intimate friendship with them, and pours forth his hopes, desires, anxieties, his fervent wishes for their welfare,

[1] Die christliche Gemeinde zu Philippi, ein exegetischer Versuch, 1833.

and his gratitude for their kindness. The epistle is more subjective than any other of Paul's; richer in expressions of feeling. It has no doctrinal arguments or dialectic reasoning, no citations from the Old Testament, no logical plan. His reasoning powers were not needed for confuting error among the Philippians; and therefore the composition has less of the formal and consecutive; less regularity of structure or sequence of argument than usual. There are sudden digressions and breaks in the succession of ideas, especially towards the end. The intimacy subsisting between himself and his readers rendered an artificial plan unnecessary. The author gives free scope to the effusions of his heart; but amid the pathos and gentleness exhibited, he never loses apostolic dignity.

PECULIARITIES IN THE COMMENCEMENT AND CONCLUSION.

It is contrary to Paul's method to specify *bishops* and *deacons* in the general salutation; and the reason why they are mentioned is not apparent. It may be because they had shown great zeal in procuring a money contribution for the apostle. It is also noticeable that the members of the church are spoken of before the office-bearers, a precedence contrary to modern ideas especially those of the clergy, who are apt to look on the people as an appendage to themselves. Several bishops are also referred to, which is an evidence of the epistle's early date, before hierarchical notions exalted one presbyter above the rest and assigned him a separate title. In the apostle's time presbyter and bishop were synonymous. The mention of bishops in the plural agrees with other notices. The church at Ephesus had its elders (Acts xx.). Jerusalem had its elders. Whether all the apostolic churches had a plurality of pastors or not, one thing is certain—that several, perhaps the ma-

jority, had. But all were not similarly organised; nor is their constitution a model for modern churches. Ecclesiastical arrangements belong to the department of expediency.

The commencement does not mention Paul's apostleship, as his other letters do. He associates Timothy with himself because the latter had been with him at Philippi; both being termed *bondmen* of Jesus. His omission of the apostolic designation may be partly explained by a motive of delicacy. He avoided the use of a title which might suggest a claim to the benefit he had received. Nor had he any reason for asserting his apostolic authority, since there were no factions in the church, and no apostasy from the faith. False teachers there had not impugned his apostleship. Paul did not care for a title, as long as there was no cause for associating it with his name. He waived the higher for the lower appellation.

Lardner observes, that the salutations in the conclusion of the epistle are singular, different from those of the other epistles written about the same time: 'The brethren which are with me greet you;' 'all the saints salute you.' We do not suppose the brethren to be Mark, Aristarchus, Jesus Justus, Demas, and Luke, who had joined the apostle at Rome; nor Euodia, Syntyche, and Epaphroditus; but rather those Christians who were in Paul's immediate circle at Rome, including perhaps Timothy and other fellow-labourers.

Persons belonging to Caesar's house are particularly mentioned as sending salutations; Caesar's freedmen and domestics, servants in the palace. It is doubtful whether any of the emperor's relations are intended, for there is no evidence that his wife Poppaea was a Christian. We cannot include Seneca or Lucan in the number. Probably the converts were chiefly Jewish slaves; for Josephus states that he was introduced to Poppaea by a Jewish comedian. It would doubtless rejoice the Phi-

lippians to hear that Christianity had entered Caesar's palace, and encourage them to expect the prisoner's release.

CONTENTS.

This epistle is the shortest addressed to any church except the second to the Thessalonians. The doctrinal and the practical are not separated, as in other Pauline letters, but are more or less blended throughout. It may be divided into six paragraphs: I. i. 1–11; II. i. 12–ii. 18; III. ii. 19–30; IV. iii. 1–iv. 1; V. iv. 2–9; VI. iv. 10–23.

I. The first part is historical, relating to the writer's condition at Rome. After the inscription and salutation, the apostle expresses his gratitude to God on behalf of the Philippians, his continual mention of them in prayer since they received the gospel, and his confident expectation that the work of peace in their hearts should be carried on to completion. He calls God to witness his deep-seated affection for them, praying that their love and knowledge might be still more abundant, and the fruits of their righteousness more manifest (i. 1–11).

II. That the Philippian believers might not be discouraged at what had befallen him, he tells them that God had overruled his imprisonment for good, making it subserve the advancement of the gospel. His bonds had become known in the praetorium and throughout the city; and several had been induced to preach the gospel more fearlessly by the example of his patient fortitude. Not that the motives of all who proclaimed Christ crucified were pure, for some envied the apostle; but as long as Christ was preached, Paul rejoiced. He expresses his confidence that the Redeemer should be magnified either by his life or death, though he thinks it more desirable that he should live a little longer, that he might meet them again joyfully. But whatever might be the issue of his present captivity, he exhorts

them to lead a holy life, to be firmly united in one spirit, and not terrified by their enemies. In pathetic strains he beseeches them to cultivate mutual love, to avoid vain glory, and to be exceedingly humble in the estimate of their own attainments. To enforce the duty of humility the more impressively, he introduces the example of Christ, who left the glories of the heavenly state to live on earth a life of lowly obedience and suffering. Having referred to Christ's self-abnegation and consequent exaltation, he exhorts them to work out their salvation with fear, remembering that the divine energy was not inactive within them; to avoid murmurings in their sufferings, and disputings for pre-eminence; to be blameless and harmless; and not only to hold fast, but to diffuse, the word of life, that he might rejoice in the day of Christ on their account (i. 12–ii. 18).

III. He promises to send Timothy to them, speaking of him as a disinterested, zealous, affectionate minister, whose excellence was well known. But he expects to be released soon, and to follow Timothy to Philippi. He then gives a reason for sending Epaphroditus in the meantime, mentioning the dangerous sickness of their messenger, his earnest longing to return, and the self-sacrificing fidelity with which he had laboured. Him he commends to their esteem, as a workman worthy of the highest honour (ii. 19–30).

IV. Understanding that there were Judaising teachers at Philippi, the apostle warns his readers against them, affirming that the true people of God are those who put no confidence in conformity to the law. Had this law furnished ground for glorying, *he* might boast of it; for he was descended from Jewish parents, a rigid Pharisee, observing all legal requirements. But he was willing to forego these pretensions for Christ, while seeking justification by faith in his righteousness alone. His great object was to *know* the Saviour, to become experimentally acquainted with him in the efficacy of his resur-

rection, which produces a spiritual resurrection in man and prepares him for glory; to endure like sufferings with Christ, and being united to him, to attain to a blessed resurrection from sin. He proceeds to describe his Christian experience as progressive, because he aimed at higher attainments in the Christian life, and therefore exhorts them to follow his example by walking after the rule they had already observed. In contrast with his own aims and conduct, he places the practices of the Judaisers, whom he describes as enemies of the true doctrine—sensual, unclean, selfish. How unlike this to the apostle of the Gentiles, whose citizenship was in heaven, and who was always looking for the Saviour to raise him to a blessed immortality. The Philippians, as having the same faith and prospects, are therefore exhorted to stand fast in the Lord (iii. 1–iv. 1).

V. Paul beseeches Euodia and Syntyche, two females in the church, to be reconciled; entreats his true yokefellow to assist several women in their labours, who had maintained the truth of the gospel along with himself and Clement; and subjoins a few general precepts relating to spiritual joy, moderation, and contentment. Virtue is recommended in the different forms in which the wisdom of ancient philosophers had presented it; and as the Philippians had seen it embodied in himself, they are enjoined to practise it in its widest aspect (iv. 2–9).

VI. He thanks the believers for the signal proof of their kindness to him, but intimates with true delicacy and nobleness of soul, that he had learned to be contented in whatever circumstances he might be placed; prepared to suffer want if needful, or to have an abundance of the conveniences of life, with an equanimity of temper trained in the school of Christ. After stating that he was more pleased with their gift as an evidence of their Christianity than as a supply of his own wants, he en-

courages them to expect an abundant fulfilment of their desires from God the Father, to whom he ascribes all the glory. The epistle closes with salutations and the usual benediction (iv. 10–23).

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1847; Meyer, 1865; Van Hengel, 1838; Wiesinger, 1850; Jatho, 1857; and Ewald, 1857.

EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

AUTHORSHIP.

THIS EPISTLE has been assigned to many authors. Some have supposed that it was written by Clement of Rome. It is true that it agrees in many places with Clement's epistle to the Corinthians, even to verbal correspondences;[1] but this proves nothing as long as the authenticity of the latter is doubtful. The writer of the letter which bears the name of Clement, borrowed from the one addressed to the Hebrews. He wrote in a practical spirit, in language unrhetorical and unperiodic; whereas a speculative character belongs to the epistle to the Hebrews—an Alexandrian tone and colouring to which the Clementine author could not have attained.

Others think that it was composed by Barnabas, the companion and friend of Paul, and rely on the following grounds:—

(*a*). Tradition favours it, as Tertullian shows,[2] in whom it does not appear to have been a conjecture, but to have rested on a historic basis. Yet the tradition could not have been general, because Jerome and Philastrius are the only others who notice it.

[1] Compare ch. xxxvi. with Hebr. i. 3, &c.; ch. xliii. with Hebr. iii. 2, 5; ch. xvii. with Hebr. iii. 2; ch. xxi. with Hebr. iv. 12; ch. xxvii. with Hebr. vi. 18; ch. ix. with Hebr. xi. 5, 7; ch. x. with Hebr. xi. 8, 9; ch. xii. with Hebr. xi. 33; ch. xlv. with Hebr. xi. 32–40; ch. xix. with Hebr. xii. 1, 2; ch. lvi. with Hebr. xii. 5.

[2] De Pudicitia, ch. xx.

(*b*). The epistle contains traces of Alexandrian gnosis. Barnabas was a Cyprian, and Cyprus was connected with Alexandria in many ways. Perhaps he himself might have been there. This shows no more than that Barnabas *might have been* the author.

(*c*). He was a Levite, and therefore well acquainted with the temple worship. Not with the temple at Jerusalem, as Hebr. ix. 1–6 shows; consequently with that at Heliopolis, as Wieseler supposes.[1]

(*d*). The epistle contains much that is Pauline, and much that is not. This suits a companion of Paul, and one also who had some independence. The same remark would apply to others; to Apollos better.

(*e*). The author does not put himself among the immediate hearers of Jesus (ii. 3); and, accordingly, we learn that he was a disciple of the apostles (Acts iv. 36, 37). This exegesis is uncertain, because Clement and Eusebius class him among the seventy disciples. But Tertullian makes him a disciple of the apostles.

(*f*). The readers of the epistle assisted the Christians at Jerusalem (vi. 10), which suits Barnabas and Paul (Gal. ii. 10). This only presupposes a Pauline church.

(*g*). The surname of Barnabas, 'son of exhortation,' i.e. of animated prophetic discourse, accords with the expression, 'word of exhortation,' in xiii. 22. But Paul was the spokesman of the two, according to Acts xiv. 12. To this it has been said, that speaking and writing are different things, not necessarily coinciding in one and the same person.

(*h*). The position of the epistle in the Peshito or old Syriac version, favours the Barnabas authorship. The letter could not have been attributed to Paul, else it would not have been put after epistles addressed to private individuals, Timothy and Titus. Because the

[1] Eine Untersuchung über d. Hebr. Br. Erste Hälfte, 1861.

framers of the Syrian canon received, besides Paul's thirteen epistles and that to the Hebrews, the epistle of James, the first of Peter and the first of John, it must be inferred that they assigned our epistle to a man who could rightfully claim the title of *apostle*—a title given to Barnabas in the Acts. Besides, Barnabas and Paul founded the Syrian church at Antioch; and therefore the former could no more be absent from their canon than the latter. Such is Wieseler's reasoning.

The epistle extant in Barnabas's name, cannot be compared with ours, because it was not written by a friend of Paul. Its authenticity is rejected almost universally. The hypothesis which makes Barnabas the author of the epistle to the Hebrews, has no conclusive argument in its favour. Against it is the fact that Barnabas's mission was to the Gentiles, according to Gal. ii. 9; which is not fairly met by Wieseler's assumption, that though he had been an esteemed member of the mother church (Acts iv. 36, 37; ix. 27; xv. 25) he could turn to the Jewish Christians, without necessarily leading us to infer from Gal. ii. 13 that he had afterwards fallen back to a Jewish Christian stand-point.

Others think that the epistle was written by Luke. This opinion is mentioned apparently by Origen, and numbers several advocates in recent times, including Hug, Stier, Ebrard, and Delitzsch. It rests on linguistic grounds mainly. A considerable number of words and phrases unknown to every other New Testament writer, are common to our epistle and Luke's writings. There are also many correspondent constructions. The language of the epistle is tolerably pure. Lünemann has collected the coincident words and phrases. But there are important differences of diction and periodic structure, opposed to identity of authorship; so much so, that the identity of the author of Luke's writings

with the writer of the epistle to the Colossians, might be maintained with equal reason, on the ground of similarity of language between our epistle and the third gospel with the Acts.[1] It should also be remembered that Luke was a Gentile Christian (Coloss. iv. 14), while the epistle evidently proceeded from a Jew by birth, because it is cast in a Jewish mould. Jewish feelings and modes of thought pervade it in a manner which Luke's writings do not exhibit. The latter show a Hellenic character and culture. It is therefore improbable that Luke wrote the epistle, though the style of the latter half of the Acts approaches near it; the language of the gospel being more remote. Whether Luke was the sole author, as Grotius believed, or the man who put Paul's ideas into a written form, as Hug, Delitzsch, and Ebrard think, the hypothesis is alike untenable.

To make the indirectly Pauline authorship more probable, an epilogue is assumed by Delitzsch, i.e. from xiii. 18 to the end, sealing the apostolic origin of the whole. Yet it is asserted that Paul allowed the words of ii. 3 to remain, though he could not have written them. Ebrard's epilogue is from xiii. 22 to the end. Against the hypothesis that Luke wrote under Paul's sanction, is the fact of the doctrinal ideas and terminology being so independent of the apostle; for though they resemble him in some respects, they differ materially in others. The supposed disciple and writer departed from the master so widely as to take characteristic views of his own.

Another opinion is that Silvanus or Silas was the writer, which needs only to be mentioned.

A more prevalent view is that Paul was the author. In favour of it many arguments have been adduced. External and internal evidence have alike contributed to support it. Let us examine the external evidence.

[1] See Köstlin in Zeller's Theologische Jahrbücher for 1854, p. 429.

1. Here the writings of the so-called apostolic fathers are silent. Though several of them show an acquaintance with the epistle, they never speak of the author. Clement's letter to the Corinthians has many passages resembling places in ours, as is shown by the parallels in De Wette. Quotations and allusions from Ignatius have been collected by Lardner, and more recently by Forster;[1] but no weight belongs to them, as long as the authenticity of the letters is uncertain. Neither can Polycarp be properly adduced, because the passages in the fourth and twelfth chapters of his epistle, cited by Lardner, are too vague. Two places have been pointed out in the epistle to Barnabas; but they are indistinct and uncertain.

The earliest testimony of the Western church, taking that phrase in a sense including the church of Italy, Gaul, and proconsular Africa, is opposed to the Pauline origin. Irenaeus († 202) did not attribute it to Paul. This fact rests on the authority of Stephen Gobar, in the sixth century, in a passage preserved by Photius: 'Hippolytus and Irenaeus say that the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews is not his.'[2] This accounts for the circumstance that Irenaeus does not employ it against the Gnostic sects, though it would have suited his purpose. But Eusebius states that he was acquainted with the epistle and spoke of it in a work now lost along with the Wisdom of Solomon, quoting some passages from both.[3] Did Irenaeus put it on a level with the apocryphal book? That is improbable. He used it in a subordinate way, since he did not think it Paul's. As to the fragment in which Irenaeus is supposed to quote Hebr. xiii. 15, as Paul's, its authenticity is more than doubtful.[4]

[1] The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 599, &c.
[2] Bibliotheca, cod. 232. [3] Hist. Eccles. v. 26.
[4] See Irenaeus's works, edited by Stieren, vol. i. pp. 854, 855; and vol. ii. p. 381, &c., ed. 1853.

Hippolytus (200), said to have been a disciple of Irenaeus, had the same opinion of the epistle as his master's.

Caius of Rome, at the close of the second and beginning of the third century, held the same view, as we learn from Eusebius.[1] The author of the fragment on the canon published by Muratori, does not enumerate the epistle among Paul's.[2] We suppose that the epistle 'to the Alexandrians forged in the name of Paul,' means that to the Hebrews, as Credner, Volkmar, Köstlin, and Wieseler[3] believe.

Novatian (250) never quotes or alludes to it, though in two treatises of his still extant, it would have been most suitable to his purpose.

Tertullian († 240), denying the Pauline authorship, ascribed the letter to Barnabas, relying, apparently, on a historical tradition current in proconsular Africa. He adduces a passage which the Montanists made use of (vi. 4, 5), in his treatise on Chastity,[4] but assigns the letter to Barnabas; though his interest prompted him to attribute as great authority as he could to the letter; for the higher its authority, the greater the force of his argument founded upon it. Had he known that the epistle was attributed to Paul by early tradition, he would surely have mentioned the circumstance. He states particulars favourable to its credit on the ground of Barnabas's authorship; but if he knew that the catholic Church rejected or lessened the credit of the letter, he would not have failed to charge them with it. It will not do to say, with Hug, that Tertullian took the epistle for what it was allowed to be by its enemies,

[1] Hist. Eccles. vi. 20.

[2] Fertur etiam ad Laodicenses, alia ad Alexandrinos, Pauli nomine finctae, ad haeresim Marcionis et alia plura, quae in catholicam ecclesiam recipi non potest. Fel enim cum melle misceri non congruit.

[3] See Wieseler's Eine Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief, p. 26, *et seq.*

[4] De Pudicitia, c. 20.

and reasoned with such force as to make it, even on this ground, equal to Paul's epistles in value; for he was not the man to adopt this course.

Marcion (140) excluded the letter from his canon, for what reason we cannot discover. As he had a high regard for Paul, it is likely that he would have adopted the epistle had he thought it to be his. That he might have accepted it as part of his canon is evident from the fact that the Manicheans used the epistle.[1]

Cyprian († 258) speaks of seven churches to which Paul wrote; but does not mention the epistle to the Hebrews, or make any use of it. Hence we infer that he did not consider it Pauline. He generally followed Tertullian.

In several MSS. of the old Latin version, the present epistle is separated from Paul's epistles. Thus in the cod. Claromontanus and the cod. Sangermanensis, the epistle is separated from them by stichometry. In the cod. Boernerianus it is wanting.

Victorinus of Pannonia († 303) is on the same side of the question. In an extant fragment, he speaks, like Cyprian, of there being seven churches which Paul addressed.[2] If his commentary on the Apocalypse be authentic, he enumerates in it the seven churches, and speaks of epistles to individuals without any notice of ours. Passages are repeatedly quoted from the Pauline epistles; none from that to the Hebrews.

Thus the Pauline authorship was disowned in the West till the beginning of the fourth century—a fact which it is difficult to account for except by supposing that an early tradition in Italy, Gaul, and proconsular Africa in favour of Paul's authorship, was wanting. Hug's attempt to show that the opposition presented to the Montanists, who defended their usage respecting

[1] Epiphan. Haeres. lxvi. c. 74.
[2] De Exhort. Martyrii, c. 11.

lapsed Christians not being received back into the church by Hebr. vi. 4, 5, led to a denial of the Pauline origin, is unsuccessful.[1] Catholic Christians did not renounce the authenticity of sacred writings so readily as Hug's reasoning implies; nor is there the least proof that Tertullian and Novatian attached such importance to Heb. vi. 4, 5 as the critic assumes.

Hilary of Poitiers († 368) was the first writer in the West, as far as we know, who received the letter as Paul's. He was followed by Lucifer († 370), Gaudentius († 410), Ambrose of Milan († 397), and Philastrius of Brescia (387). But doubts still lingered. It is not quoted by Optatus of Milevis (370), by Phoebadius (359), and Vincent of Lerins († 450), in Gaul; nor by Zeno of Verona († 380). Isidore of Seville († 636) says that the authorship was considered doubtful by very many Latin Christians, because of the difference of style.

Jerome († 420) and Augustine († 430) favoured the opinion that it was written by Paul; and the authority of their names contributed to establish it in the West.

In many places the former quotes passages from the epistle, calling it Paul's, or the apostle's.[2] Elsewhere he refers to peculiarities distinguishing it from other writings of the apostle's, and gives some explanation of them.[3] In other places, when mentioning or quoting the work he employs expressions of hesitation or doubt, such as, 'if any one is willing to receive that epistle which has been written to the Hebrews, under Paul's name;'[4] 'the epistle of Paul to the Hebrews, or whose-

[1] Introduction, translated by Fosdick, p. 597.

[2] Ep. 66 ad Pammach. Adv. Jovinian. lib. i. 5. Ep. 3, 60 ad Heliodor. Comment. in Esaiam, c. 5, v. 24; c. 7, v. 14. In Jerem. c. 22, v. 1–5. In Zechar. c. 3, v. 6, 7. In Matt. c. 21, v. 39. In Gal. c. 4, v. 3.

[3] De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, c. 5.

[4] Comment. in Titum, c. 1, v. 5.

soever's you suppose it to be;'[1] 'Paul the apostle speaks, if any one admits the epistle to the Hebrews;'[2] 'whoever he be that wrote the epistle;'[3] 'the apostle Paul, or whatever other person wrote the epistle,' &c.[4]

In alluding to the opinion of the Latin church, he says, that many doubt about Paul's authorship;[5] that the Latin custom was, not to receive it among the canonical scriptures;[6] that all the Greeks admitted it, and some of the Latins;[7] and that among the Romans even till his time, it was not reckoned the apostle Paul's.[8] The longest passage which this father has about it is in a letter to Dardanus, where he states that the epistle 'is received as the apostle Paul's, not only by the churches of the East, but on the other hand by all the Greek ecclesiastical writers; though most ascribe it to Barnabas or Clement; and it makes no difference whose it is, since it belongs to an ecclesiastical man, and is read daily in the churches. But if the Latins do not commonly receive it among the canonical scriptures, the Greek churches do the same with the Apocalypse of John. We, however, receive both, not following the usage of the present time, but the authority of ancient writers, who for the most part quote both; not as they are wont sometimes to quote apocryphal books as canonical.'[9] Here there is an

[1] Comment. in Titum, c. 2, v. 2. [2] In Ezech. c. 28, v. 11, *et seq.*
[3] In Amos, c. viii. v. 7, 8. [4] In Jerem. c. 31, v. 31.
[5] In Matt. c. 26, v. 8, 9. [6] In Esaiam, c. 6, v. 2.
[7] Ep. 73, ad Evangelum. [8] De Script. Eccles. c. 59.
[9] Illud nostris dicendum est, hanc epistolam quae inscribitur ad Hebraeos, non solum ab ecclesiis orientis, sed ab omnibus retro ecclesiasticis Graeci sermonis scriptoribus quasi Pauli apostoli suscipi, licet plerique eam vel Barnabae vel Clementis arbitrentur; et nihil interesse, cujus sit, cum ecclesiastici viri et quotidie ecclesiarum lectione celebretur. Quodsi eam Latinorum consuetudo non recipit inter scripturas canonicas, nec Graecorum Apocalypsin Johannis eadem libertate suscipiunt; et tamen nos utraque suscipimus nequaquam hujus temporis consuetudinem, set veterum scriptorum auctoritatem sequentes, qui plerumque utriusque abutuntur testimoniis non ut interdum de apocryphis facere solent (quippe qui et gentilium litterarum raro utantur exemplis), sed quasi canonicis.

ambiguity in the words '*most* ascribe it to Barnabas or Clement.' The sense is 'most Greek writers,' not Latins. We draw the following conclusions from Jerome's testimonies.

First. He believed that Paul did not write the letter, because in speaking of the Greeks he intimates his disagreement with their opinion.

Secondly. Where his language is ambiguous, his caution about orthodoxy was the cause. Careful of his reputation, he hesitated where free speaking might have damaged it.

Thirdly. The great majority of the Latins did not receive the epistle as Paul's. Only some adopted it.

Fourthly. He fully believed in its canonicity; and probably held it to be Paul's *indirectly*.[1]

Fifthly. He alleges that most of the Greek writers who received it as Pauline did not ascribe it to him *immediately*, but merely through Barnabas or Clement.

Augustine's († 430) sentiments are scarcely consistent. In his commentary on the epistle to the Romans, he alludes to it as *the apostle's*. In his treatise on *Christian Doctrine*, he specifies it as one of the fourteen Pauline epistles. In his sermons, he quotes it as *the apostle's*. In the decrees of several synods where his influence was considerable, it is given after Paul's thirteen letters, as in the synod of Hippo (393), and the third of Carthage (397) which attest its canonicity; but in the fifth of Carthage (419), it is one of Paul's fourteen letters. It is alluded to as *Scripture* in other works.[2] There are many places in which Augustine avoids giving an opinion about the author, employing indefinite phrases: as, 'the epistle which is written to the Hebrews;' 'which the majority say is Paul's, but some deny;' 'the epistle to the Hebrews;' 'which

[1] See Wieseler, Eine Untersuchung u. s. w., p. 40, *et seq.*

[2] Enarrat. in Psalm. cxxx. § 12; Contra Maximin. Arian. lib. ii. c. 25.

is inscribed to the Hebrews.' Doubtless he reckoned it a part of the canonical Scriptures, induced to do so as he affirms, by the authority of the oriental churches; but it is doubtful if he really believed it was Paul's. In a passage in his work on 'Christian Doctrine,' where he puts it among the other epistles of Paul, the context makes a distinction between canonical books, assigning greater weight to such as were received by all the catholic Churches than to those adopted by fewer and less important churches.[1] It is not easy to account for the circumlocutory phrases he uses so often, except on the ground of his entertaining doubts about the author. In his later works he avoids quoting the epistle as Paul's. In his work on the 'City of God,' which occupied him fourteen years, he cites it often without naming the writer. And in his unfinished work on Julian, though the latter quotes the epistle as Paul's, Augustine calls it merely, 'the epistle to the Hebrews.' 'One would think,' says Lardner, 'that he studiously declines to call it Paul's.' The result of an examination of all that Augustine has expressed on the subject is this:—

First. He knew the fact that some of the Latin churches denied the Pauline origin of the epistle.

Secondly. He himself sometimes quotes it as the apostle's and was inclined at one time to believe so.

Thirdly. Oftener, and particularly in his later writings, he scrupled to quote it as Paul's, having doubts about its Pauline origin, not its canonicity. These doubts were not sufficiently strong to induce him to speak directly against the Pauline authorship, or he had not courage to contradict the opinion of the majority. He did not take the side of the minority openly, from want of conviction, or from fear.

Rufinus (410) naturally followed Jerome; and every

[1] De Doctr. Christ. ii. 12.

writer of note in the West belonging to the fifth century, took the view ostensibly held by Jerome and Augustine; as Chromatius († 410), Innocent of Rome († 416), Paulinus († 431), Cassian († 450), Prosper (434), Eucherius († 450), Salvian († after 490), and Gelasius († 394). Pelagius (425) wrote on Paul's thirteen epistles, not on our epistle. Yet he speaks of it as a work of the apostle.

From the beginning of the fifth century, the Pauline authorship was generally acknowledged in the Latin church. But even after Jerome and Augustine, several commentators do not quote it, as Leo the Great († 461), and Orosius (420). About the middle of the sixth century, no Latin commentary on it was known to Cassiodorus (470–564).

At Alexandria the case was different respecting the epistle. Though Basilides (about 125) the Gnostic used the Pauline epistles he rejected that to the Hebrews, because it did not proceed from an apostle of Christ. Pantaenus attributed it to the apostle. In the time of Basilides, it was received at Alexandria, but not as Paul's. Pantaenus's testimony inserted by Clement in his lost work *Hypotyposes*, has been preserved by Eusebius.[1] It is generally supposed that 'the blessed presbyter,' whom Clement speaks of, is Pantaenus; and there is no good reason for doubting it. Pantaenus obviates an objection to the Pauline authorship from the want of the name. Clement himself asserts († 220), that Paul wrote it in Hebrew, and Luke translated it into Greek.

In like manner, Origen († 254) often employs it as a Pauline writing. One passage may suffice: 'And in the letter to the Hebrews, the same apostle says,' &c.[2] This distinguished father, knowing that individuals and churches questioned its Pauline composition, expresses

[1] H. E. vi. 14.

[2] Καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους ὁ αὐτὸς Παῦλός φησιν.—*In Joann.* tom. ii.

his purpose to write a distinct discourse in proof of it, in a letter to Africanus. In other places he alludes to doubts respecting its Pauline authorship, as in his comments on Matt. xxiii. 27.

Eusebius († 340) has preserved an extract from Origen's homilies on the epistle to the Hebrews, which gives a more exact account of the learned father's opinion respecting the origin of our epistle. Here we have Origen's mature judgment, if it is to be had anywhere. The homilies were preached and published in the latter part of his life, when he was upwards of sixty years of age. 'The style of the epistle with the title "to the Hebrews" has not that rudeness of speech which belonged to the apostle who confessed himself rude in speech, that is, in phraseology. But the epistle is purer Greek in the texture of its style, as every one will allow who is able to discern differences of style. Again he says, the ideas of the epistle are admirable, and not inferior to the acknowledged writings of the apostle. Every one will confess the truth of this who reads the apostle's writings attentively. Afterwards he adds: I would say that the sentiments are the apostle's; but the language and composition belong to some one who committed to writing what the apostle said, and reduced into a commentary, as it were, the things spoken by his master. If then, any church receives this epistle as coming from Paul, let it be commended even for this; for it is not without reason that the ancients have handed it down as Paul's. But who wrote (was the amanuensis of) the epistle, God alone knows certainly. The account that has come down to us is various; some saying that Clement, who was bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; others that it was Luke, who wrote the Gospel and the Acts.'[1] We see:—

[1] ὁ χαρακτὴρ τῆς λέξεως τῆς πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἐπιγεγραμμένης ἐπιστολῆς, οὐκ ἔχει τὸ ἐν λόγῳ ἰδιωτικὸν τοῦ ἀποστόλου, ὁμολογήσαντος ἑαυτὸν ἰδιώτην εἶναι τῷ λόγῳ, τουτέστι τῇ φράσει. Ἀλλὰ ἐστὶν ἡ ἐπιστολὴ

First. That different opinions about the writer of the letter were entertained in Origen's day, and doubts about the authorship were so common that he could allude to them in a popular discourse, without giving offence or raising suspicions against himself. The words, 'if any church receives it as Paul's, it is even to be commended on that account' imply that some had doubts of its Pauline authorship. The language is hypothetical; and the inference, that only a few churches received the epistle as Paul's or that any church rejected it as his, cannot be rightly drawn from it. Bleek does not explain the words of Origen correctly, as Tholuck has perceived.

Secondly. Origen's own belief was, that while the sentiments of the epistle proceeded from the apostle, some other person wrote them down. This explains the apparent inconsistencies observable in his different works. He often cites it as Paul's, without scruple or remark; but in his homilies he says, 'God alone knows who wrote it.' The expression 'who wrote the epistle,' can only mean *who put the thoughts into writing, who penned another's ideas. Such* kind of writing some attributed to Clement of Rome, others to Luke; but Origen gives no opinion.[1]

συνθέσει τῆς λέξεως Ἑλληνικωτέρα, πᾶς ὁ ἐπιστάμενος κρίνειν φράσεων διαφοράς, ὁμολογήσαι ἄν. Πάλιν τε αὖ, ὅτι τὰ νοήματα τῆς ἐπιστολῆς θαυμάσιά ἐστι, καὶ οὐ δεύτερα τῶν ἀποστολικῶν ὁμολογουμένων γραμμάτων. Καὶ τοῦτο ἂν συμφήσαι εἶναι ἀληθὲς πᾶς ὁ προσέχων τῇ ἀναγνώσει τῇ ἀποστολικῇ. Τούτοις μεθ' ἕτερα ἐπιφέρει λέγων· Ἐγὼ δὲ ἀποφαινόμενος εἴποιμ' ἄν, ὅτι τὰ μὲν νοήματα τοῦ ἀποστόλου ἐστίν, ἡ δὲ φράσις καὶ ἡ σύνθεσις ἀπομνημονεύσαντός τινος τὰ ἀποστολικά, καὶ ὡσπερεὶ σχολιογραφήσαντος τὰ εἰρημένα ὑπὸ τοῦ διδασκάλου. Εἴ τις οὖν ἐκκλησία ἔχει ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστολὴν ὡς Παύλου, αὕτη εὐδοκιμείτω καὶ ἐπὶ τούτῳ· οὐ γὰρ εἰκῇ οἱ ἀρχαῖοι ἄνδρες ὡς Παύλου αὐτὴν παραδεδώκασι· τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ μὲν ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν· ἡ δὲ εἰς ἡμᾶς φθάσασα ἱστορία ὑπό τινων μὲν λεγόντων, ὅτι Κλημής ὁ γενόμενος ἐπίσκοπος Ῥωμαίων ἔγραψε τὴν ἐπιστολήν· ὑπό τινων δὲ ὅτι Λουκᾶς ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις.—H. E. vi. 25.

[1] Unless we make Origen stultify himself in the passage, *τίς δὲ ὁ γράψας τὴν ἐπιστολήν, τὸ ἀληθὲς Θεὸς οἶδεν* must mean the scribe, rather the proper author, for the preceding context states that this father

Thirdly. It is difficult to understand what he meant by the words, 'ancient men have handed it down to us as Paul's.' He could not mean all the ancients, including Christians in the East and West. Probably he refers to the ancient men of the Alexandrian church, i.e. to Pantaenus and Clement, with the generation dependent upon them.

Fourthly. There is little doubt that Origen speaks of traditions then current. These accounts had existed before his time; the field they were disseminated in was Alexandria.

Origen, as we have just seen, believed Paul to be the author, and accounted for the diversity of style between it and other Pauline epistles by assuming that some one penned the ideas with the apostle's sanction or by his direction. The power of tradition was so strong that he could not reject Paul's participation in the letter; yet his critical judgment could not reconcile the language with external testimony. Hence he assigned the thoughts to Paul, the diction to another.

Dionysius (248), a disciple of Origen, ascribes the work to the apostle without hesitation, in his epistle addressed to Fabius, bishop of Antioch, and preserved by Eusebius.[1] Theognostus of Alexandria (A.D. 282), also assigns the epistle to Paul. So too Peter (300), Alexander (315), Hierax (about 300), Athanasius († 373), Theophilus († 412), Serapion († 358), Didymus (395), and Cyril of Alexandria († 444), employ the epistle, ascribing it to the apostle. The deacon Euthalius (460) again speaks of doubts, which he sets aside. The prevalent opinion of the Alexandrian church was in favour of the Pauline authorship. In accordance with

believed the thoughts to be Paul's, the recording of them another's. Delitzsch is right in saying that, 'it is vain to adduce *ὁ γράψας τὸ εὐαγγέλιον καὶ τὰς πράξεις*,' in the succeeding context, for then too Luke worked up material not his own.

[1] H. E. vi. 41.

it, the tenth place was usually given to the epistle, i.e. after the second to the Thessalonians. So it is in Athanasius, the council of Laodicea, the Memphitic version, the author of the 'Synopsis of sacred Scripture,' Euthalius and Cyril. Nor was this confined to the Alexandrian church; other Greek fathers gave it the same place, as Theodoret and Epiphanius. The oldest Greek MSS. agree, such as, A., B., C., H.

Out of Egypt, in the Greek church, the current tradition was the same. The council of Nicaea received the epistle as Paul's, which appears from a reply given by Eusebius, in the name of the assembled bishops, where it is quoted as his.[1]

Justin Martyr († 166) has several passages which show an acquaintance with the epistle. He writes, for example, 'This is he who, after the order of Melchizedek, is King of Salem, and everlasting priest of the Most High.'[2] Elsewhere, 'about to be both everlasting priest of God, and King, and Christ.'[3] In another work he writes that Christ is called both Angel and *Apostle*.[4] All that can be inferred from such statements is, that the epistle was current in the Christian circle to which Justin belonged.

Eusebius of Caesarea quotes the letter very frequently, especially in his commentary on the Psalms, and attributes it to the apostle. He puts it among the fourteen and the *Homologoumena*. In the third book of his 'Ecclesiastical History' he says expressly, 'Of Paul there are fourteen epistles, manifest and well known;'

[1] καθώς φησι καὶ ὁ Παῦλος τὸ σκεῦος τῆς ἐκλογῆς, Ἑβραίοις γράφων, κ.τ.λ.—See *Harduin. Acta Concilior.* vol. i. p. 402.

[2] οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ κατὰ τὴν τάξιν Μελχισεδὲκ βασιλεὺς Σαλήμ, καὶ αἰώνιος ἱερεὺς Ὑψίστου ὑπάρχων. (Hebr. v. 9, 10; vi. 20; vii. 12.)—*Dial. cum Tryph.* p. 379, ed. Thirlby.

[3] Καὶ αἰώνιον τοῦ Θεοῦ ἱερέα, καὶ βασιλέα, καὶ Χριστὸν μέλλοντα γίνεσθαι.—*Ibid.* p. 347.

[4] Καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος.—*Apol.* i. c. 63, p. 81, ed. St. Maur.

subjoining, 'yet there are some who reject that to the Hebrews, urging in favour of their opinion, that the church of the Romans denies it to be Paul's.'[1]

In other places the historian speaks differently. In his 'Ecclesiastical History' he writes: 'For Paul, having addressed the Hebrews in their own tongue, some think the evangelist Luke—others, Clement, translated the epistle, which last appears more probable, since there is a great resemblance between the style of the epistle of Clement and the epistle to the Hebrews, as well as between their sentiments.'[2] This passage implies that the writer had an opinion like Origen's, viz. that Paul wrote in Hebrew, Clement translating into Greek. But a statement in his commentary on the second Psalm is different, indicating that Paul wrote the epistle in Greek. Elsewhere, he alludes to it as a work belonging to the *Antilegomena*, or disputed Scriptures, in the time of Clemens Alexandrinus, because he says, that Clement, in his 'Stromata,' uses testimonies from the 'Antilegomena,' the book called the 'Wisdom of Solomon,' that of Jesus son of Sirach, the epistle to the Hebrews, Barnabas, Clement, and Jude.

The general conclusion we draw from Eusebius's writings is, that he accepted the epistle as Paul's, and used it as such. 'Nevertheless,' says Lardner, 'perhaps it may be questioned whether he was fully persuaded of it.'

The Pauline authorship was commonly held in the Greek church after Eusebius. Cyril of Jerusalem

[1] Τοῦ δὲ Παύλου πρόδηλοι καὶ σαφεῖς αἱ δεκατέσσαρες. Ὅτι γε μήν τινες ἠθετήκασι τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους, πρὸς τῆς Ῥωμαίων ἐκκλησίας ὡς μὴ Παύλου οὖσαν αὐτήν, ἀντιλέγεσθαι φήσαντες, οὐ δίκαιον ἀγνοεῖν.—*H. E.* iii. 3.

[2] Ἑβραίοις γὰρ διὰ τῆς πατρίου γλώττης ἐγγράφως ὡμιληκότος τοῦ Παύλου, οἱ μὲν τὸν εὐαγγελιστὴν Λουκᾶν, οἱ δὲ τὸν Κλήμεντα . . . . . ἑρμηνεῦσαι λέγουσι τὴν γραφήν· ᾧ καὶ μᾶλλον εἴη ἂν ἀληθὲς τῷ τὸν ὅμοιον τῆς φράσεως χαρακτῆρα τήν τε τοῦ Κλήμεντος ἐπιστολήν, καὶ τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους ἀποσώζειν, καὶ τῷ μὴ πόρρω τὰ ἐν ἑκατέροις τοῖς συγγράμμασι νοήματα καθεστάναι.—*H. E.* iii. 38.

(† 389), Gregory of Nazianzum († 390), Basil the Great († 379), the council of Laodicea (363), Gregory Nyssene († after 394), Titus of Bostra († 371), Epiphanius († 402), Chrysostom († 407), Theodore of Mopsuestia († 429), received it. And if the Iambic poem addressed to Seleucus, be rightly assigned to Amphilochius of Iconium († 394), he may be also quoted for the Pauline authorship. Gregory Thaumaturgus († about 270), ascribes it to Paul, quoting, or referring to various passages, such as ii. 3, 4; iii. 15–18.

As to the Syrian church, the epistle is in the Peshito, but at the end of the Pauline epistles before the general ones. Delitzsch argues that it was put there because anonymous, not because it was thought to proceed from another than Paul.[1] But in that case it would rather have stood among the Pauline ones, between those to the Corinthians and Galatians, or after the Thessalonian ones, certainly before the pastoral epistles. The Peshito has it merely with the title, 'Epistle to the Hebrews.' The later Syriac, which was dependent on the Greek, first gave it the title, 'Epistle of Paul.' After the Peshito, the Syrian church generally believed in the Pauline authorship, unless Hippolytus be reckoned an exception before he settled at Ostia, in the first half of the third century, who held that the epistle was not written by Paul, according to the testimony of Stephen Gobar in Photius. About the middle of the third century, the synod of Antioch ascribes it to the apostle. Jacob of Nisibis (325), and Ephrem († 378), so quote it, as does Severian bishop of Gabala (401). Isaac bishop of Nineveh († 550), and Ebed-Jesu († 1318), reckon it the fourteenth of Paul's epistles.

We have given a very brief summary of the patristic evidence, which need not be followed further. Those

[1] Ueber Verfasser und Leser des Hebräerbriefs, in Rudelbach und Guericke's Zeitschrift, 1849, p. 510.

who wish to see it drawn out at length, are referred to Bleek,[1] who is exceedingly full on the subject, and from whom succeeding critics have taken their lists of passages.

The following is the result of external evidence on the subject.

In the Western or Latin church, the epistle was not considered apostolic till the fourth century, when it first obtained a canonical position and was assigned to Paul. The causes which contributed to this change in the church cannot be traced. Perhaps the ecclesiastical intercourse between the East and West, which began at the time, brought the sentiments of the former into the latter. Above all, the weight of two names, Jerome and Augustine, greatly influenced the formation of such an opinion. It has been conjectured, that the Arian controversy, in which the epistle was useful to the orthodox cause, helped to establish its apostolicity. It may be also, that the study of Origen's writings had its influence. We know that Hilary and Ambrose, in particular, were familiar with them.

In the Eastern or Greek church, tradition was early and uniformly in favour of the Pauline authorship. The Greek fathers believed that it proceeded from the apostle of the Gentiles. The exceptions were few.

The early Syrians did not hold the Pauline authorship; but the fathers of that church began to do so in the third century. Thus patristic evidence is divided, and the testimonies conflicting. Taken in the mass, it favours the Pauline origin of the letter. Judged separately, especially in its earliest state, its voice is against it. If the letter were written in Rome or Italy, the Italians must have known whether Paul wrote it or not; and their rejection of it is, consequently, a strong argument against its apostolic authorship. We rely

[1] Der Brief an die Hebräer, erste Abtheilung, viertes Kapitel, p. 81, *et seq.*

more on the earliest testimony, which is against Paul's authorship, than on the later, and believe that the rejection of that authorship by the Latin church far outweighs the opposite evidence. The letter was written either in Italy or at Alexandria; so that the Westerns knew better than the Asiatics who wrote it. It tells against the Pauline origin that Pantaenus *first* held that opinion at Alexandria.

2. Having considered the external evidence bearing on Paul's authorship, we proceed to the internal. Here there is much to discountenance the idea that the apostle wrote the epistle.

(*a*). The want of a title or inscription strikes the reader. The name of the writer does not appear, contrary to Paul's method. As the Jewish Christians were prejudiced against him, he must have appealed, if not to his apostleship, at least to the revelations he had received, the purity of his motives, and his ardent love to his countrymen. Such things would have been most suitable had Paul wished to get a favourable hearing.

At an early period, those who assumed the Pauline authorship endeavoured to reconcile the absence of the apostle's name with that fact, by supposing, with Pantaenus, that the writer, conscious of his mission to the Gentiles not the Jews, omitted his name out of modesty; or with Clemens Alexandrinus, that Paul avoided an inscription lest he should offend the Hebrews, who had prejudices against him. Jerome gives the same explanation as Clement's, which has continued down to the present day. Hug adds another, viz. that the epistle is a discourse as far as the doxology in xiii. 12, rather than a letter; and therefore, a salutation with the apostle's name would not have been appropriate. None of the hypotheses is probable; and the omission of the name at the commencement of the letter remains a strong presumption against the Pauline authorship. It is so especially, when we reflect that Paul did not in-

trude into the sphere of activity occupied by others (2 Cor. x. 13; Rom. xv. 20). He was the apostle of the Gentiles—not of the Jews. Hence it is unlikely that he would have written to Jewish Christians.

(*b*). The manner in which the Old Testament is quoted invalidates the Pauline authorship. The writer knows the Jewish Scriptures only in the Septuagint version. Even where the latter departs from the meaning of the original it is followed, as in x. 5–7. The author has a few trifling deviations from the Septuagint; but neither in them nor in any case, not even in x. 30, did he consult the Hebrew. On the other hand, where the Greek version departs *materially* from the Hebrew text, Paul never follows it except in Rom. xv. 12. Again, when Paul quotes the LXX., his citations commonly agree with the Vatican copy. The epistle to the Hebrews uniformly follows the Alexandrian one.[1]

A separate examination of the citations will show the correctness of these remarks. Thus that in i. 7 is from the Septuagint, according to the Alexandrian copy. The original Hebrew means, that God makes the winds his messengers and the lightnings his servants. But in the Greek rendering which our author follows, the sense becomes, 'He makes his angels winds and His servants flames of fire,' implying that angels are changed into those elements by the will of God to do his pleasure.

The citation in i. 8, 9, from Psalm xlv. 6, 7, is also different in sense from the Hebrew. The latter is, 'thy God's or divine throne is for ever and ever,' referring to a Hebrew king at his nuptials; the author of the epistle to the Hebrews takes the nominative (God) as a vocative, and considers it an address to the Messiah.

[1] Bleek, Der Brief an die Hebräer, erste Abtheilung, sections 79–83, pp. 338, 381.

The quotation in i. 10–12, from Psalm cii. 25–27, also gives a very different meaning from that of the original. The Hebrew words contain an address to Jehovah; the writer of our epistle applies them directly to Christ, misled, in all probability, by the term κύριε in the LXX. which was commonly applied to Christ in the time of the apostles.

Another in i. 13, from Psalm cx. 1, refers to the Messiah, according to our author. The Psalm was not written by David, but contains an oracle spoken to him when he was preparing to fight against powerful foes. Though the words cited are addressed to David in the Hebrew, they are here quoted as addressed to Christ.

While these and other citations show how dependent the author was upon the Greek translation even where it misinterprets the original, they also prove that the apostle Paul was not the writer, else he would have proceeded more independently.

Still further, none of the introductory formulas and quotations so common in Paul's epistles, such as, *as it is written*, *for it is written*, *the Scripture saith*, &c., &c., appear in our epistle. Neither are the rarer formulas of Paul used, *David says*, *Moses says*, *Isaiah says*. The epistle to the Hebrews refers its citations neither to *Scripture*, nor to *persons* or *authors*, but to the Holy Spirit or to God, with one exception (ii. 6). In cases where the verb *says* has no nominative, *God* should be supplied, not *Scripture*. Only two exceptions occur, viz. ii. 6, and xii. 21, where the indefinite *one*, and *Moses said*, occur. But the latter is inexact, because the words of Moses in Deut. ix. 19, are transferred to the time when the law was promulgated, by an incorrect reminiscence. It is probable that a stricter view of inspiration than that of Paul underlies the introductory formulas of our author. We agree with Tholuck in thinking, that some passages in the epistle contain reminiscences from Paul's writings, as x. 30,

compared with Rom. xii. 19; and xii. 14, compared with Rom. xii. 18.[1]

(*c*). The writer betrays an imperfect knowledge of the temple and its furniture. He is even mistaken in some particulars; a thing that could not be asserted of Paul, who lived in Jerusalem for a considerable time. In the 9th chapter, the Jewish tabernacle is divided into its two principal parts; the first apartment, and the inner one or holy of holies. In specifying their furniture the author mentions, in the first, the candlestick, the table, and the shew-bread; in the second, the golden altar of incense, with the ark of the covenant containing the pot of manna, Aaron's rod, and the tables of stone.

The pot of manna and Aaron's rod are put in the ark of the covenant, which is opposed to 1 Kings viii. 9; 2 Chron. v. 10, where it is expressly declared that the ark had nothing in it but the two tables of stone. And the golden altar of incense is put in the holy of holies; whereas it was in the first apartment, towards the veil that separated the one from the other.

In answer to this it has been said, that the author does not speak of the temple of Solomon or that which was built after it, but of the original tabernacle constructed by Moses. Even in the tabernacle, however, Aaron's rod and the pot of manna were *before*, not *in* the ark (Exod. xvi. 33; Numb. xvii. 10); with which both Josephus and Philo agree when they relate that the ark contained nothing but the tables of stone. As the later Rabbins have the same view as that in the epistle, Levi ben Gerson and Abarbanel giving it, the author may have followed a tradition different from Scripture. The word translated *altar of incense* is ambiguous, and may mean *the censer*. We prefer the former meaning, because it is sanctioned by the authority of Josephus and Philo. In either case, there is an error,

[1] Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer, Einleitung, p. 46, 2nd ed.

since we learn from the Mishna that the censer was *taken into* the holy of holies by the high priest, not *kept* there. The whole passage also shows, that though the writer had respect to the tabernacle, he transferred both divisions of it, with all the furniture, to the temple of his own day, which he believed to possess the ark, the pot of manna, and Aaron's rod. What belonged to the original tabernacle he supposed to have equally belonged to the temple of his time. The present tense used in the sixth verse (the priests *enter in*), and in the seventh (*offers*), along with the present-perfect (these things *having been* thus *ordained*, verse 6), shows that the arrangements of the tabernacle are supposed to be still existing; whereas Herod's temple wanted the ark and tables of stone. Hence the author proves his ignorance of the temple at Jerusalem; and Delitzsch's attempt to show that the alteration of the furniture was made on purpose to suit certain symbolical views of the holy of holies, can only be regarded as unsuccessful.[1] Like ignorance appears in ix. 19, where it is a mistake to say that the blood of the sacrifices was mixed with water. The blood would have been vitiated by the addition of water, except in accidental cases.

(*d*). According to ii. 3, the writer was not an apostle, but had received the gospel from ear-witnesses, and occupies the same position as Luke's. 'How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation; which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and *was confirmed unto us by them that heard him*?' Here the readers of the epistle are represented as belonging to the second Christian generation, because they had received the gospel from ear-witnesses of the facts in Christ's history, and from the first preachers. The author classes himself with the readers—'was confirmed unto *us* by them that heard him.'

[1] Commentar zum Briefe u. s. w., p. 358, *et seq.*

The only way of escaping the force of this argument is by calling in the aid of a rhetorical figure,[1] by which the writer includes himself among those he addresses. Such a mode of speaking occurs in the epistle to the Hebrews, and in the Pauline letters. But Bleek rightly limits it to hortatory addresses, where an author may include himself with propriety among his readers, because the consciousness of moral infirmity is an attribute of universal humanity. Although therefore the context has the figure '*we* ought to give heed,' 'how shall *we* escape,' we must suppose that it is immediately dropped (*was confirmed unto us*), when a historical fact is expressed. It is also difficult to see how Paul could forbear in that passage to remind the Jerusalem Christians that the Lord himself had worked and taught in their midst, had suffered before their eyes, and found the first witnesses of his resurrection and ascension among them.

(*e*). The hermeneutical principles of the epistle differ from those of Paul. The author allegorises and treats the Old Testament as commonly typical. In this respect he goes much further than the apostle, who allegorises single passages as Gal. iii. 16, and more too, as in iv. 22, &c.; the latter being the most conspicuous instance in his writings. Our author spiritualises the person of Melchizedek, whom he considers a type of the Son of God. The history of this priest in Genesis is viewed typically; all that is said of him, down to the very name, and all that is not said of him, being significant. Such interpretation reminds us of Philo and the Rabbins, who were fond of discovering a secret sense in Scripture. The tabernacle or temple is also allegorised.

Akin to allegorising is the play upon words, of which there is a notable example in the use of the term *cove-*

[1] Called ἀνακρίνωσις.

nant (ix. 15–18), which has the meaning *testament* besides. The writer employs an argument or illustration based upon the double sense of a word.

(*f*). The doctrinal system of the epistle to the Hebrews differs from the Pauline, as appears from the following particulars.

(*α*). The relation of Judaism to Christianity.

Here Judaism is essentially a priesthood; and in this lies both its temporary and its perpetual character—its transience and its unchangeableness. It is changed, and with it the law also. The incomplete priesthood becomes complete; and therefore the law cannot continue as it was, a weak and profitless thing, but something else must arise out of it. Priesthood is the primary thing, law the secondary; the former determining the latter. Because priesthood is changed, the law must be changed, the latter being subordinate to the former. The view of Paul is different. He considers Judaism as a law not as a priesthood; a law which has to be fulfilled. The Pauline view of Judaism is subjective; that of our epistle, objective. Paul has to show that the law cannot bring man into a right relation to God because he is unable to fulfil it; the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, that the priestly arrangements in the Old Testament cannot effect reconciliation to God because of their defective character. According to Paul, the ground of Judaism being unsatisfactory does not lie in the law, but in man's relation to it; according to our author, the ground is in the constitution of Judaism itself—an imperfect constitution, which had to be superseded—a priestly arrangement, whose defectiveness necessarily implies the defectiveness of the law also.

The essence of the Old Testament religion consisting in the idea of priesthood, we can readily see how Christianity has an absolute preference over Judaism. It is because Christ is a different high priest from the Old Testament one. Levitical priestism is far inferior to

the truly priestly Christianity. Christ is a high priest for ever, unchanging and eternal; the Levitical priests were always changing. So too the law, which was weak and unprofitable, was removed because of its inefficiency. What the Levitical and legal constitution of Judaism could not do, was accomplished in Christianity. Perfection came by the latter; for while the law was merely *a shadow* of good things to come, Christ was *a high priest* of good things to come, that is, of things real and substantial; of the invisible, archetypal world, the heavenly, the true, of the things not made with hands (viii. 5; ix. 23, 24); not subject to change, but abiding for ever. The present world is related to that original world as its shadow. Hence Judaism and Christianity are contrasted as two worlds, the archetypal and the copy; the future and the present. Christianity is *the world to come* (ii. 5). Agreeably to this representation, the relation between the old and new religions is not so wide as it is in Paul; with whom the contrast is between law and gospel, letter and spirit, bondage and sonship; unlike the antithesis in our epistle of type and prototype, intimation and realisation, shadowy outline and completion, sensuous shell and spiritual kernel, this world and the future, earth and heaven. Christianity contains nothing absolutely new in itself—nothing that did not exist already in the Old Testament. Paul lays stress upon the fact that the promise was given before the law, and not invalidated by it; our author, that it was given after the law (ch. vii.).

The relation between Jewish and Gentile Christians under the New Testament, is also looked at differently by Paul and the writer of this epistle. The former does not make Jewish Christians the proper nucleus and body of the Church, but Gentile ones; the latter, who never mentions Gentile Christians, must have considered Jewish believers the true, essential portion of the Church.[1]

[1] See Riehm's Der Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefs, p. 232, *et seq.*

(β). The christology of our epistle is also different from the Pauline. It stands, in fact, midway between the Pauline and Johannine. Both Paul and our author represent Christ as a pre-existent and superhuman being; but the former dwells much more on the originally human aspect of his person; whereas the latter dropping this, transfers him to a higher region, as a purely divine being. But the Son is not yet *the Word* in the sense of the fourth gospel. Our author holds, that God created the world by the Son; Paul says, that all things were created by, and consist *in him*. The former affirms, that the Son upholds all things by the word of his power. Thus the Son is put higher over the world than he is by Paul. In the 15th chapter of the first epistle to the Corinthians, it is stated, that Christ will ultimately deliver up the dominion to the Father; according to the epistle to the Hebrews, his dominion is everlasting. The christology of our epistle advances beyond the Pauline.

The Pauline idea, that Christ is the first member of a renewed humanity—the second Adam, from whom all receive grace, righteousness, and life—is not in our epistle.

The idea that Christ is a *Spirit*-(πνεῦμα), a quickening Spirit (1 Cor. xv. 45; 2 Cor. iii. 17), is also a Pauline one which is not here.

To define the divine nature of the Son, the author of our epistle uses the term *Spirit* not *Word*. The Spirit is the absolute principle of his life, the indwelling element of his essence, so that he is a purely spiritual being like God himself. The fact of Christ's resurrection recedes into the background; that of the ascension is prominent, in our epistle. He is the *heavenly* high priest. The reverse holds good of Paul's epistles, in which special importance is attached to Christ's resurrection, and efficacy ascribed to it in the work of redemption; while the ascension is scarcely mentioned.

The christological terminology of our epistle is also different from the Pauline. The only two expressions common to both, are *the Son of God* and *the first-begotten*; all others differ. Instead of *image of God*,[1] our author has, 'the brightness of his glory, and the express image of his person.'[2]

While we cannot deny that there is some agreement between the christology of our epistle, and that of the Pauline ones, especially the later to the Colossians and Philippians; the difference is too important to be overlooked. The writer goes a step beyond the Pauline, which he has worked upon and developed with freedom and independence. His knowledge of Christ was derived directly or indirectly from Paul's preaching; he unfolds that knowledge in his own way.

(γ). Again, the idea of *reconciliation*[3] which is prominent in the Pauline doctrine of Christ's work, is foreign to our epistle. The apostle views Christ as suffering and dying; in his passive rather than active obedience. In the epistle to the Hebrews, he has a more active and independent position. His sacrifice, according to Paul, was a vicarious one, satisfying the righteousness of God before all, taking away sin and its punishment. Christ died instead of all men. According to the author of the letter to the Hebrews, the efficacy of Christ's death consists mainly in purification, not in substitution. Christ is an active self-sacrificing high priest standing between God and the sacrifice, a mediator accomplishing a sacrificial work. The Messiah indeed is sacrificed; but he is not a mere passive offering, because he offered himself, and was not, as in Paul, offered up by divine justice. His offering was also completed at his entrance into heaven—which is an unpauline idea.

[1] εἰκὼν τοῦ Θεοῦ (2 Cor. iv. 4; Coloss. i. 15; iii. 10).

[2] ἀπαύγασμα τῆς δόξης (Θεοῦ) καὶ χαρακτὴρ τῆς ὑποστάσεως αὐτοῦ— (Hebr. i. 3).

[3] καταλλαγή.

(δ). The Pauline contrast of *faith* and *the law* or the *works of the law*, and the connection into which the apostle brings *faith* with *righteousness*, are also foreign to our epistle. *Faith*, in the epistle to the Hebrews, is general and indefinite, meaning confidence in God, or in his word and promises (vi. 1; xi. 1; iv. 2). In the Pauline writings, it is more sharply and definitely apprehended, having for its object the promise already fulfilled in Christ. It is a living trust in him, in whom God's righteousness is revealed and offered, and is termed *the faith of Jesus Christ*;[1] a belief in Christ, or in Him who raised up the Lord Jesus from the dead; and is opposed to the *works of the law* not to *doubt*, as in the epistle to the Hebrews. The 'righteousness according to faith' (xi. 7), is different from Paul's 'righteousness, which is by faith;' and in place of the Pauline 'works of the law,' we have 'dead works,' works without life.

Another distinction is, that the Pauline view of faith puts the Christian into mysterious personal union with Christ. Believers live, die, rise with Christ. Christ is in them, and they in Christ. The epistle to the Hebrews has nothing of this. It sets forth Christ *for* us, not Christ *in* us.

(ϵ). Again, the divine favour is shown, according to Paul's writings, by the act called *justification*[2] in the epistle it is manifested by *sanctifying*; and Christ, not God, is the sanctifier (ii. 11). With Paul, God is *the justifier*, not Christ.

In describing the effect of Christ's atoning work, the terminology of our epistle is quite different from the Pauline. The ideas involved in the words, *to purify* and *to make perfect*,[3] do not occur in Paul. He uses, indeed, the former term; but not in the sense it

[1] πίστις Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ—πίστις εἰς Χριστόν—πίστις ἐν Χριστῷ.
[2] δικαίωσις. [3] ῥαντίζειν, καθαρίζειν, τελεοῦν.

has in the epistle to the Hebrews. Instead of the conceptions belonging to both, Paul employs the word *justify*. Believers are *sanctified*, *sprinkled*, *purged* by Christ, according to our epistle; they are *justified* by God, according to Paul.

(ζ). The writer does not know the power which sin has over men according to Paul, making it impossible for them to fulfil the law; nor the misery and condemnation in which mankind are on that account, as long as they are under the law. He never speaks of the power of the flesh over the spirit, or of the impossibility of performing works that justify; but rather proceeds on the principle of the freedom of the human will, referring to the divine reward of good conduct (xiii. 16; vi. 10).

(η). Judgment and the subjugation of enemies are ascribed to God, not as by Paul to Christ himself.

(θ). The death of Christ is represented as principally designed for the Jewish people, the only exception being ii. 9. Hence the frequent use of the term *people* in the epistle. Either the writer's perception of the fact that Jesus died for all men was faint, or he keeps it in the background. The latter is the more probable supposition. A revelation designed essentially for the Gentiles, must have been viewed with suspicion by readers strongly inclined to Judaism, and would injure the effect of his admonitions. Hence the author drops the universal aspect of the death of Christ expressed in the 2nd chapter, and speaks thenceforward of its relation to the Jewish people only.

(κ). *Transcendence* not *immanence*, lies at the basis of the epistle, which builds up an ideal, heavenly, superterrestrial world, viewing the present as empty, unsubstantial, phenomenal. *Reality* can only be predicated of God, or of that other state, the present being but a shadow; an imperfect, weak, remote echo of the heavenly one. Hence the dualism between God and the world

is essential and absolute. The lower world has no elements which are transferred to the higher, and cannot be brought into union with God, because it is unreal. In Paul's writings, the idea of *immanence* prevails. Though God is separate from the world as the infinite, invisible, and perfect One, He is continually working *in* and *upon* it, nature and humanity being but a reflection of Himself. The Pauline dualism between present and future, this world and the next, is only one of times and states; not absolute, but temporary. God and the world will be reunited. The real and true here will be taken over into the higher state.

These observations suffice to prove, that the circle of doctrinal ideas in which Paul and our author move, is not the same. Christianity is looked at differently. So is Judaism. The person of Christ is viewed in separate lights. It is probable that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews set out from a basis similar to Paul's, for there are many points of agreement between it and the conceptions embodied in the epistle; but he has developed it in his own way, and stamped another character upon it. If he were a Pauline Christian, which he can hardly be called, he reflected independently of his master. That he was Alexandrian in the tone of his thinking, there is little doubt. His doctrinal ideas constitute Christian Alexandrianism, in contradistinction from Paulinism. It is instructive to compare his doctrinal conceptions with those of Paul and the fourth gospel, between which they form an intermediate link; nearer the latter than the former, though there are similarities to both.

(*g*). It was early felt that the language and style of the epistle are different from Paul's. Hence Clement thought that the work was translated. For the same reason Origen attributes the thoughts to Paul; the dress they are clothed in, to another. This distinguished father, who was no mean judge of Greek as

may be gathered from different parts of his writings, believed that the Greek of the epistle is better than Paul's, appealing to every judge; and his opinion has been ratified by the most eminent scholars.

Stuart collected a catalogue of Hebraisms to show what none disputes, that the language of the epistle is far from being classical. It is beside the mark to quote religious terms which have been transferred from the Old Testament into the theological language of every nation as well as the Greek tongue. The dissentients from Origen's opinion, should prove that the author of the epistle to the Hebrews has employed Hebraistic expressions as symbols of ideas for which the Greek language has more appropriate words of its own. When this be done from a lexical point of view, something effective is accomplished; till then, an industrious array of Hebraisms, like Stuart's, is useless. We do not maintain that the language of the epistle is free from Hebraisms; but that the diction is purer than Paul's. In respect to purity, it stands on a level with the latter half of the Acts, where many of the expressions quoted by Stuart from the epistle to the Hebrews as Hebraisms, are also found. Tried by his mode of procedure, any of Paul's epistles not only presents as many Hebraisms as that addressed to the Hebrews, but would exhibit far more if a parallel could be found among them, viz. a letter addressed solely to Jewish-christians and occupied with a description of the Jewish economy in relation to the Christian system. The subject itself necessarily induces more Hebraisms than any treated by Paul; yet the epistle has really fewer.

All the *grammatical* Hebraisms in the epistle are these: the genitive of a substantive along with another substantive, in place of an adjective, as in i. 3; iv. 2; v. 13; vi. 1; and the undeclining of foreign names, as Aaron, vii. 11; ix. 4; Cherubim, ix. 5; Jericho, xi. 30; Jerusalem, xii. 22.

The following are all the examples of a *lexical* kind which occur: λαλέω applied to divine disclosures, i. 1; ii. 2; ix. 19—*γεύομαι θανάτου*, ii. 9—*σπέρμα* for *posterity*, ii. 16; xi. 18—*σὰρξ καὶ αἷμα* for *corporeity*, ii. 14—*παρρησία confidence*, iii. 6; iv. 16; x. 19, 35—*χάριν εὑρίσκειν*, iv. 16—*ὁμολογία faith professed*, iii. 1—*εὐλογία blessing*, vi. 7; xii. 17—*τὸ ὄνομα Θεοῦ*, a periphrasis for God himself—*οἰκτιρμοί*, x. 28—*ἐγκαινίζειν*, ix. 18; x. 20—*ἐργάζεσθαι δικαιοσύνην*, xi. 33—*ὁλοθρεύω*, xi. 28—*ὁμολογεῖν τινι*, xiii. 15—*ῥῆμα promise*, vi. 5—*ἐξέρχόμαι ἐκ τῆς ὀσφύος*, vii. 5—*ἰδεῖν θάνατον*, xi. 5—*οὐχ εὑρίσκετο*, xi. 5—*μὴ προστεθῆναι αὐτοῖς λόγον*, xii. 19—*περιπατέω ἐν*, xiii. 9—*καρπὸς χειλέων*, xiii. 15—*ἐνώπιον Θεοῦ*, xiii. 21—*κοπή overthrow*, vii. 1—*καρπὸς εἰρηνικός*, xii. 11.

In a *syntactical* respect, we have the Hebraising constructions *ἀποστῆναι ἀπὸ* instead of the genitive, iii. 12—*λαλεῖν ἐν* for *διά*, i. 1—*ὄμνυμι κατά τινος*, vi. 13—*καταπαύειν* intrans. with *ἀπό*, iv. 10; *εἶναι εἴς τι*, viii. 10—*ἱλάσκεσθαι τὰς ἁμαρτίας* instead of *τὸν Θεόν*, ii. 17.

The following list of peculiarities is De Wette's, revised and sifted.

Different formulas introductory to quotations: *λέγει, μαρτυρεῖ τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον*, or *Θεός*; or merely *λέγει, εἴρηκε, μαρτυρεῖ, φησί*, i. 5, 6, &c., 13; iii. 7, 15; iv. 3, 4, &c., 7; v. 5, &c.; vi. 14; vii. 14, 17, 21; viii. 5, 8, 13; x. 5, 8, 9, 15, &c., 30; xi. 18; xii. 5, 20, 26. Paul has *γέγραπται, καθὼς γέγραπται, ἡ γραφὴ λέγει, ἐγράφη, κατὰ τὸ γεγραμμένον, ὁ λόγος ὁ γεγραμμένος*; or *Μωϋσῆς γράφει, Δαβὶδ λέγει, ὁ νόμος λέγει* and such like. Only Ephes. iv. 8, and v. 14, are like the epistle to the Hebrews. Rom. xv. 10; 2 Cor. vi. 2; Gal. iii. 16, are somewhat similar.

The characteristic expression applied to Christ by Paul, is *ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Χριστὸς Ἰησοῦς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν*; but the epistle to the Hebrews has only the single appella-

tions ὁ Ἰησοῦς, ὁ κύριος, Χριστός—Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς three times, and ὁ κύριος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦς once. Thus the compound appellations are characteristic of Paul; the single ones of the epistle to the Hebrews. It may be correct, as Stuart asserts, that those compound formulas occur but sixty-eight times in all the Pauline letters; but even so, we naturally expect appellations compounded with κύριος oftener than they appear in our epistle. It has only one such, while there are seventeen at least, in the epistle to the Romans. Again, *Jesus* occurs seven times in our epistle; whereas in that to the Romans, which is longer, it is found but twice; and in the first epistle to the Corinthians once. These facts tell against the Pauline authorship. *Apostle* is applied to Christ, iii. 1—μισθαποδοσία, ii. 2; x. 35; xi. 26—μισθὸς in Paul—ὁρκωμοσία, vii. 20, 21—αἱματεκχυσία, ix. 22—οἰκουμένη μέλλουσα, ii. 5—τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά, ix. 11; x. 1—μέτοχον εἶναι, γίνεσθαι, iii. 1, 14; vi. 4; xii. 8; but Paul has κοινωνόν, συγκοινωνὸν εἶναι, κοινωνεῖν, συγκοινωνεῖν—ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς, i. 3—ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ θρόνου τῆς μελαωσύνης ἐν τοῖς οὐρανοῖς, viii. 1—ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ θρόνου τοῦ Θεοῦ, xii. 2; ἐν δεξίᾳ τοῦ Θεοῦ, x. 12; in Coloss. ἐν δεξιᾷ τοῦ Θεοῦ καθήμενος. The writer of our epistle uses the verb καθίζω intransitively; whereas with a similar context, Paul uses it transitively. The former says, Christ sat down on the right hand of the throne of the majesty, &c., &c.; whereas the apostle of the Gentiles says, 'God the Father seated him at his own right hand,' &c. Ἡγούμενοι, xiii. 7, 17, 24—κακουχεῖσθαι, xi. 37; xiii. 3—συγκακουχεῖσθαι, xi. 25—θρόνος τῆς μεγαλωσύνης, viii. 1—θρόνος τῆς χάριτος, iv. 16—τὸ πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίζειν, x. 29—τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ καταπατεῖν, x. 29. Nouns feminine in ις are numerous, as ἀθέτησις, vii. 18; ix. 26—μετάθεσις, vii. 12; xi. 5; xii. 27—κατάπαυσις, iii. 11, 18; iv. 1, 3, 5, 10, 11, &c. &c.—τελειοῦν, ii. 10;

v. 9; vii. 19, 28; ix. 9; x. 1, 14; xi. 40; xii. 23—τελείωσις, vii. 11—λαμβάνειν used in a peculiar way with the accusative, as πεῖραν, ἀρχὴν λαμβάνειν, xi. 29, 36; ii. 3. It is of no use to heap together a number of accusatives with the same verb, in Paul's writings, as Stuart has done, because in such instances the verb is not employed in the same manner. Προσέρχεσθαι τῷ Θεῷ, iv. 16; vii. 25; x. 1, 22; xi. 6. Κρείττων in a peculiar sense, *more excellent*, i. 4; vi. 9; vii. 7, 19, 22; viii. 6; ix. 23; x. 34; xi. 16, 35, 40. One solitary example of the adjective with the same meaning in Paul's thirteen epistles (1 Cor. xii. 31), leaves the frequency of its peculiar usage in the epistle to the Hebrews untouched. Εἰς τὸ διηνεκές, vii. 3; x. 1, 12, 14—εἰς τὸ παντελές, vii. 25—διαπαντός, ix. 6; xiii. 15; *living God*, *living word*, *living way*, iii. 12; ix. 14; x. 31; xii. 22; iv. 12; x. 20—ἐάνπερ, iii. 6, 14; vi. 3—the frequently occurring ὅθεν, ὅσον, τοσοῦτο, ἀδύνατον—παρὰ after the comparative, i. 4; ix. 23; xi. 4; xii. 24; the frequent use of πᾶς in the singular.

The opponents of the Pauline authorship do not now insist upon the number of words found in the epistle to the Hebrews only; because, though there are 118 such, there are 230 in the first epistle to the Corinthians. The argument derived from these terms is only valid within certain limits. Such as were chosen to suit the rhetorical character of the epistle, or arose out of the author's characteristic circle of ideas, are in point. Hence De Wette has properly retained some such terms and phrases as occur nowhere else in the New Testament.

As to the style of the epistle, every reader feels that it is unlike Paul's. It is oratorical. The periods are regular and rounded; the rhythm smooth. The structure of sentences is more exact and complete than the Pauline; with less abruptness and vigour. Full-toned expressions, words of a poetical complexion, are abun-

dant. We miss the apostle's dialectic method, his fiery energy and impassioned style; and have in its stead the dignified, stately, polished eloquence of one who built up rhythmical periods. This oratorical character has influenced the choice of single words and phrases, leading to the adoption of fuller terms; though it is not so much seen in them as in the conformation and succession of sentences, where it indicates unmistakably another hand than Paul's. In the case of single words, it appears in the use of less common in preference to colloquial ones, as several which are found only in the epistle show; whose quality, not their number, gives them a voice against the Pauline authorship. Thus *brightness* and *express image* (i. 3) are employed, instead of Paul's *image of God*; and such full-toned, poetical words as μισθαποδοσία for μισθός, μεγαλωσύνη (not μέγεθος), ὁρκωμοσία, αἱματεκχυσία, πολυμερῶς καὶ πολυτρόπως, κ.τ.λ.

Greek particles are used in our epistle with greater copiousness and variety than in any of Paul's of equal length. Thus τε usually followed by καὶ occurs nineteen times; whereas in the epistle to the Romans, containing three chapters more than ours, it appears but thirteen times; and in first Corinthians only four times. It is remarkable how often γὰρ is used, even where other conjunctions might have been more appropriate. The use of ἀλλά before a negative question is singular (iii. 16); no example occurring in the epistle to the Romans. So too the employment of εἶτα in the progress of an argument (xii. 9), and of δήπου (ii. 16).

The care observable in the conformation of sentences has been often noticed. The author studied euphony and rhetorical effect. This is exemplified in the first three verses of the epistle, where there is the music of poetry, its stately dignity and full-toned utterance. Another example is conspicuous in vii. 4, where the position of the word *patriarch*, which Paul never uses,

gives a fine effect to the sentence. Instances may also be seen in xii. 1, 2; vi. 4–6; v. 7–10; vii. 22; ix. 11, 12.

While the writer of our epistle abounds in participial constructions, he keeps them from embarrassing the simplicity and regularity of his periods, as they often do in Paul's epistles.

We find the subordinate and principal clauses (protasis and apodosis) of a sentence correspondent to one another, which contributes to the rounding of periods. Compare ii. 2–4, 14, 15; ix. 13, 14. There are no anomalies (anacolutha) so frequent in Paul. Long parentheses, with shorter ones thrown into their midst as the impassioned spirit of the great apostle hurries forward, piling clause on clause, do not turn the construction aside from the method of its commencement. The sentences are not marked by interruptions, inversions, involutions. The calmness of the writer prevents such ruggedness. Bleek quotes a striking example from xii. 18–24 where, though there is a long parenthesis enclosing a shorter, the thread of discourse is continued without departure from the right construction. Compare also vii. 20–22; v. 7–10; xii. 1, 2. The only apparent exceptions are in ii. 9 and iii. 15.

What is the conclusion to be drawn from style? If the tone of the writer be elevated, rhetorical, polished, elegant, is it not unlike the fiery force of Paul's? Let it be admitted that the apostle's style varies in his epistles; the dissimilarity observable here is not explained by the fact; because the diversity which appears in his writings is compatible with a substantial unity indicating sameness of authorship. Let it also be admitted that Paul's relation to the Palestinian Christians differed from his relation to other believers, because he was not one of their teachers. Yet he did not found the Roman church; and the style of the epistle addressed to it is very different from that of the present. The object he had in view and the subject discussed will not

explain the elevated tone; these did not need a loftier diction than the subjects of some other Pauline epistles. The contents of the letter to the Romans demanded an equally oratorical style. If it be thought that because the epistle resembles a treatise on a great subject it should be dignified, calm, and solemn; Paul's fire does not burst forth even in the hortatory part. No trace of his characteristic manner appears there. Besides, is it not strange that the apostle should adopt a purer Greek and higher style of writing in an epistle addressed to Jewish-christians—to readers who were the worst judges of good Greek? Had they been cultivated Gentiles, an elegant tone would have been appropriate; why polish the diction and round the periods for the use of Jewish believers? We are therefore brought to the conclusion, that the apostle Paul did not write the letter. Its style and diction are better than his.

These arguments cannot be overthrown by attempts to find parallels between the language of this epistle and of those written by the apostle; which, however plausible, cannot mislead a true critic. De Groot[1] adduces a great array of passages in our epistle and the Pauline writings, where the same or synonymous words are employed; or where the shade of thought is peculiar and homogeneous, though the language be somewhat different. With the same object, Forster has given full lists of words in the Septuagint or apocrypha, which occur only in Paul's epistles and that to the Hebrews; of words not in the Septuagint or apocrypha found only in the two classes of writings; and of words occasionally occurring elsewhere in the New Testament, but peculiar in the manner or frequency of their occurrence to the epistles compared. Other linguistic parallels are gathered by Stuart with laborious diligence. All such reasoning is delusive, because none denies some similarity of ideas and diction

[1] Disputatio qua epistola ad Hebraeos cum Paulinis epistolis comparatur. 1826, 8vo.

in the epistle to that of the Pauline letters. That similarity, however, is weakened by the fact that the internal relation of the epistle to the Pauline writings is scarcely so great as the likeness between it and Peter's first epistle. It is the diversity amid the similarity which makes a different writer probable—the characteristic conceptions and terminology indicating an independent author. As a Christian who had come in contact with Paul, he who wrote our epistle must necessarily present points of agreement with the apostle; as a distinct person living in another intellectual atmosphere, he exhibits features not Pauline—lines of thought and modes of expression betraying an Alexandrian spiritualism.

How then does the matter stand with regard to the Pauline authorship? Is ecclesiastical tradition on the one side, and internal evidence on the other? Not so. Early tradition is divided on the subject, the West and East disagreeing. Oriental tradition itself is not unanimous before the fourth century; nor did the Western unite in a Pauline authorship before the fifth. Internal evidence combined with the early Western scepticism, outweighs the tradition of the Eastern church. If it be said that the very difficulties of style, phraseology, &c., presented by the epistle increase the force of the external testimony, since nothing but a thoroughly authentic tradition could have maintained itself against these difficulties, we reply, that the difficulties changed the tradition by compelling the writers who followed it to resort to an *indirect* Pauline authorship. So far from enhancing, they weaken the strength of the external evidence by the hypothesis that the thoughts only are Paul's, the composition and language another's.

The most probable hypothesis is that of Luther, which ascribes the authorship to Apollos. All phenomena in the epistle agree best with this view, which accounts for the similarity of the doctrine to Paul's, and its dissimilarity at the same time. Though Apollos was a friend

of the apostle, he occupied so independent a position as to be made the head of a party in the Corinthian church. The allegorising character of the epistle, its typification of the Old Testament, its familiarity with the Septuagint, its accord with Alexandrian philosophy, suit Apollos. We see that the author's acquaintance with the Old Testament was derived entirely from the Greek version, that he knew little, if aught, of the Hebrew text, and that there is a great resemblance between the work and Philo's writings in reasoning, ideas, phrases, and words. As Apollos was an Alexandrian Jew, an eloquent man and mighty in the Scriptures, he might well write the epistle. In any case, no Palestinian Jew was the author; since the latter was so imperfectly acquainted with the arrangement of the temple at Jerusalem, and viewed the Old Testament institutions as shadowy emblems of Christianity; disregarding the letter for the spirit, or rather extracting a hidden sense which sets aside the original purport of the historical one. This Philonian method argues a style of thought moulded by Jewish-Alexandrian philosophy, in the first century of our era. The writer either read Philo, or was imbued with the spirit of his teaching. The probability that Apollos wrote the epistle is not weakened by Delitzsch's statement respecting the near relationship which Paul's acknowledged letters bear to Philo's Alexandrianism;[1] because that relationship, so far from being near, is distant in comparison with ours. Neither is it set aside by the fact that Clement of Rome, writing to the Corinthians and using the epistle to the Hebrews, does not designate the latter as the production of their former teacher Apollos; or by the silence of the ancient church with respect to the Apollos hypothesis.[2] External evidence on this point cannot avail against internal grounds

[1] Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer, Einleit. pp. xxvi. xxvii.
[2] Wieseler's Eine Untersuchung u. s. w., p. 69.

—least of all the absence of such evidence. If it did, we should believe that the apostle Paul was the writer, either directly in his own person, or through the medium of another; a hypothesis which all good critics reject, including Wieseler himself.

It is not necessary to show how much of Philo's peculiar style and sentiment was owing to his Jewish, and how much to his Alexandrian habits of thought. The advocates of the epistle's Alexandrian authorship should not be asked to do an unreasonable and impossible thing. It is sufficient for them to make it as probable as the nature of the case allows, that a Christian Jew of Alexandria, not of Palestine, was the author. We do not say that a Jew who had never left Palestine *could not* have written the epistle; but we affirm that all evidence is clearly against that hypothesis, and in favour of an Alexandrian Jewish-christian. Stuart's attempt to prove that there is nothing in the evidence contrary to the fact that the epistle might not have been written by a Palestinian Jew, is entirely futile. No Palestinian could be so ignorant as to say that the high priest went *daily* into the temple to offer sacrifice (vii. 27); whereas Philo, having regard to Onias's temple, speaks of the high priest's *daily* ministrations.[1]

It is admitted that the typical mode of interpretation was not peculiar to the Alexandrian Jews. Those of Palestine used it; but not to the same extent or in the same manner. If a distinction were made between typical interpretation and allegorising, the former is more applicable to the Palestinian Jews; the latter to Philo. Let it be allowed that Philo's allegories have to a great extent a different character from the typification of our epistle, though this assertion of Mynster's is questionable; the method of the latter, the point of view

[1] εὐχὰς δὲ καὶ θυσίας τελῶν καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν.—*De speciall. legg.* vol. ii. p. 321, ed. Mangey.

from which its author surveys the Old Testament, and the extent to which he allegorises the Jewish economy, resemble Philo more than a Palestinian. It is unreasonable to look for an exact parallel between Philo's doctrine and that of our author, because the one was a Jew and the other a Christian. Mynster's statement too, approved though it be by Tholuck, that the spirit of Philo is as distant from the epistle's as heaven is from earth, is an exaggerated one.[1] Whatever limitations there be to the resemblance between the school of Philo and our author, no critic will deny that the likeness exists in a manner and to an extent which Palestinian Judaism does not admit of. It is therefore unavailing on the part of Tholuck to quote Olshausen and Doepke for Palestinian exegesis, or Von Coelln and Mynster about Philo, in order to break the force of the similarity between the method of the Alexandrian Jews as exemplified by Philo, and the Palestinians. Though the line of demarcation between Palestinian and Alexandrian Judaism was not so sharply marked then as it afterwards was between the latter and Rabbinism; both were distinguished by individual features, indicating the presence or absence of a free breath proceeding from the Platonic philosophy. It is to be regretted that Frankel has thrown no light upon the subject in his two books on the Septuagint, though the title of one leads the reader to expect it.[2]

The question whether the writer made use of Philo's writings is difficult but unimportant. Bleek has selected from Schulz and others twenty-two passages, which resemble some in the epistle, in idea or expression, or both; and it is not easy to resist the impression that the correspondence is more than accidental. A perusal

[1] Ueber den Verfasser des Hebräerbriefs. Studien und Kritiken für 1829, p. 336.

[2] Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta, 1841; Ueber den Einfluss der Palästinischen Exegese auf die Alexandrinische Hermeneutik, 1851.

of them makes it probable that the author of our epistle had read Philo, an opinion which Tholuck's remarks do not much weaken. Like the Alexandrian writer, our author attaches symbolical considerations and religious reflections to Old Testament expressions, and weaves special explications of single points into the course of the general argument, so that the constructive character of the epistle bears a great resemblance to Philo's writings. The constant habit of appending ideas to history, the alternation of reflections of very different kinds, the perpetual returning from digressions into subordinate points, to the general sequence of ideas, is in the manner of the Alexandrian Jew.

The same idea is expressed with regard to the same promise made to Abraham, both in vi. 13 and Philo, viz. that God did not swear by another but by Himself.[1] King of Salem is interpreted 'King of Peace,' as in vii. 1, &c.;[2] while the rare word, rendered 'without mother' (vii. 3), is in Philo.[3]

The statement, 'Moses was faithful in all his house, (iii. 5), is in Philo,[4] in the very same words; and the term, translated 'brightness,'[5] is a frequent Philonian one. So also the Alexandrian writer often speaks of the word of God having a cutting and dividing power,[6] similarly to the description of it in iv. 12.

The peculiar expression, 'High Priest of our profession,' is Philonian;[7] and 'the Father of spirits' (xii. 9), refers to Philo's view of the soul's origin. The narrative respecting Moses refusing to be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, and preferring the reproaches attaching to his people, to the splendour of a court

[1] Leg. Allegor. vol. i. p. 127, ed. Mangey. [2] Ibid. p. 102.
[3] De Ebrietate, vol. i. p. 368. [4] Leg. Allegor. pp. 128, 132.
[5] Ἀπαύγασμα.
[6] Quis rerum divinarum haeres, vol. i. pp. 491, 492, 504, 506.
[7] De Somniis, vol. i. 654. Mangey, however, thinks the reading corrupt.

(xi. 24–26), is like Philo.[1] Philonian passages, i.e. such as are conceived and expressed similarly to others in Philo, being reminiscences of them, are: v. 13, 14; vi. 13, &c.; vii. 7–26; ix. 7; x. 22, 23–29; xi. 1, 9–16, as may be seen in Carpzov's 'Sacred Exercitations' on the epistle. The quotation in xiii. 5 is Philonian;[2] xi. 4 and xiii. 2 agree with passages in his writing. Indeed, all the 11th chapter is in Philo, often verbally.

Against Apollos has been adduced the fact that there is no trace of his authorship in the early Alexandrian church. But if we cannot go further back than Pantaenus, the tradition of the Apollos authorship may have disappeared in the interval between A.D. 66 and 180. The early Christians neglected to preserve the names of sacred writers till they were often lost; and even Paul's emerged in connection with the present epistle, at a time when nothing certain could have been known on the subject. The Pauline advocates are exposed to a stronger objection. Why did the early Roman church uniformly reject the Pauline authorship? If the apostle wrote it towards the end of his captivity, the Christians at Rome must have known it. And if it were addressed to the Jewish-christians there, from some other place, is it likely that no trace of the tradition would have existed early in the second century? How is it that the whole Western Church disallowed Paul's authorship?

It is also alleged against Apollos, that there is no trace of his name in connection with the epistle in ecclesiastical tradition generally. Clement, Barnabas, Luke, are mentioned—Apollos never. This is a difficulty which cannot be solved for want of information. It may help, perhaps, to an explanation of it, that when the catholic Christians of the second century wished to form a list of the sacred books, and to get names for the

[1] De Vita Mosis, vol. ii. p. 84.
[2] De Confusione Linguarum, vol. i. p. 430.

anonymous ones, they would take those best known. Clement was a conspicuous man in the Roman church, the reputed author of an epistle; Barnabas was Paul's companion and an apostle; Luke was the evangelist and an associate of Paul. Apollos's name was not so conspicuous as any of these; nor was he intimately associated with Paul. He would therefore be passed over, while they were adopted by the early makers of canons.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

It is probable that the epistle was composed before the destruction of Jerusalem, because temple-worship is supposed to exist at the time. 'Every high priest *is* ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices. . . . . There are priests that *offer* gifts according to the law' (viii. 3, 4). 'The priests *go* always into the first tabernacle, accomplishing the service of God; but into the second the high priest goes alone once every year, not without blood' (ix. 6, 7). The whole passage (ix. 6–10) speaks of something still existing. 'As the high priest *entereth* into the holy place every year,' &c. (ix. 25). 'For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood *is brought* into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, *are burned* without the camp. Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Let us go forth, therefore, unto him without the camp, bearing his reproach' (xiii. 11–13). 'That which decayeth and waxeth old is ready to vanish away' (viii. 13). These statements agree best with the opinion that Jewish worship had not been abolished at its *centre*. From xiii. 23, 24 it appears, that Timothy was no longer Paul's companion; so that the notice of his imprisonment alludes to a period after the apostle's death, i.e. after A.D. 64. The Jewish insurrection against the Roman dominion broke out in Judea and Alexandria A.D. 66, of which there is no specific mention in the

epistle. Yet the agitations and ferments that ushered in the Jewish war had begun, since signs of Christ's second coming were visible (x. 25); and the readers were exposed to trials which exercised their patience (xii. 4, 5; xiii. 13). In view of all the circumstances, we conclude that the letter was probably written A.D. 66. As to the place, the closing verses are inconsistent with the supposition that Paul wrote it at the end of his Roman captivity, for xiii. 19 does not imply that he was deprived of liberty and hoped to be speedily restored to it; nor do the words of xiii. 23 intimate that Timothy was his fellow-prisoner. On the contrary, the writer was not in Italy, as we see from xiii. 24. 'They of Italy salute you,' is a phrase implying that the writer was not in that country. Had he and the persons saluted been there, he would have said, 'they in Italy,' according to the analogy of 1 Peter v. 13. Probably Italian Christians, who had fled from their country on the breaking out of Nero's persecution and taken refuge in the locality of the author, are indicated by the expression. It is impossible to discover the place where he was. It may have been Ephesus or Alexandria. The Sinaitic MS. with C. has only the subscription, 'to the Hebrews;' but A. has 'from Rome,' and K. 'from Italy.'

THE PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED.

It is difficult to arrive at a satisfactory conclusion respecting the readers for whom the work was originally designed. The title, 'to the Hebrews,' which did not proceed from the author, though it is found in the oldest MSS., as ℵ, A., B., D., does not contribute to the settlement of the question, because the New Testament use of 'Hebrew' is simply an Israelite by nation and religion, a descendant of Abraham, as Phil. iii. 5, and 2 Cor. xi. 22, attest. The attempt to restrict it to the Jews of Palestine, as distinguished from those dwelling

in other countries, is more plausible than satisfactory. Our choice lies between two opinions, viz. that Jewish-christians in Palestine, especially at Jerusalem, were addressed; or Jewish-christians at Alexandria. The former has always been the prevailing view and is supported by various arguments, the strongest of which are these:—

1. The letter was written to Jewish-christians exclusively. No reference occurs to other converts, a fact pointing to Palestine, where alone the church consisted of Jewish believers.

The fact that the congregations in Palestine were unmixed with Gentile converts is liable to doubt, as Acts x. 44, 45; xi. 1, &c.; xv. 7, &c., show. Besides, it is not correct that the readers are supposed to be Jewish-christians exclusively. Native Gentiles may have been among them.

2. Chap. xiii. ver. 12, states that Jesus suffered 'without the gate,' supposing the readers' familiarity with Jerusalem.

To know that fact, it was not necessary to live in Jerusalem.

3. Those addressed had been exposed to reproach and persecution (x. 32–34), showing that the author was thinking of the early time of the Christian church at Jerusalem, and especially the persecutions preceding and following Stephen's martyrdom.

As the readers of the epistle must have been a second generation of Palestinian Christians, and had not yet resisted unto blood, we cannot see with what propriety the writer could have alluded to persecutions which they did not themselves endure.

On the other hand, serious difficulties lie in the way of this view.

1. The epistle was written in Greek, not Aramaean. The latter would have been more suitable to Jewish-christians in Jerusalem, since it was the medium of

religious intercourse. The work is even composed in a more polished Greek, which would make it less appreciated by the mass of the church there. Besides, the author's knowledge of the Old Scriptures rests so exclusively upon the Septuagint, that he reasons on that basis where it departs entirely from the Hebrew, which he would hardly have ventured to do had he been writing to Palestinians.

2. The writer reproaches his readers with ignorance of Christianity, considering the time that had elapsed since they became acquainted with it. They should have been teachers, not babes. This is unsuitable to a church, from which all the teachers of Christianity originally proceeded; and is particularly out of place in the mouth of one who was not himself an immediate disciple of Christ (ii. 3). A church which had men like James at its head, from which Silas and Mark proceeded, could not have been so weak in faith or lukewarm, as to be in danger of falling back into Judaism, between A.D. 60 and 70.

3. The epistle speaks of a strong leaning, on the part of the readers, to the temple worship. They had a great desire to return to the Jewish hierarchy and the institutions connected with it. This is inapplicable to the Christian church at Jerusalem, in which, judging from Acts ii. 46; v. 42; xxi. 20–26, the native Jews adhered to the temple worship from the beginning. How could they be warned against apostasy from what they were attached to? The 'strange doctrines' of xiii. 9 refer to Mosaic institutions; how could the Jewish worship be strange to the Christians at Jerusalem, who were not afraid of reproaches because they maintained an old custom sanctioned by the example of the apostles themselves? It is clear from Acts xxi. 20, that the fanatical Jewish-christians at Jerusalem, as well as those out of Palestine, insisted upon circumcision and the observance of the customs.

4. The Christians in Judea were poor, for which reason they had received the contributions of churches abroad. This does not harmonise with the contents of the epistle, which warn the readers against covetousness (xiii. 5), recommend liberality (xiii. 1, 2, 16), and praise them for beneficence (vi. 10). According to Wieseler, the last passage even affords a presumption of these very Christians having contributed to the collections made for the poor saints in Jerusalem. And he is right in that opinion; for *the saints* is a standing appellation of the Jerusalem Christians. Those who were called first by Christ and his apostles—the first recipients of the divine word—are so styled by way of eminence.

5. Considering the separation that took place between Paul and the great mass of the Christians at Jerusalem, it is difficult to understand how one standing in near relationship to Paul, and entertaining the same views as he did about the obligation of the law, could have been so closely allied to the church as xiii. 18, 19 implies, or sent to them greetings from the Italians, who were unknown to the Jerusalemite believers.

These arguments are decisive against the hypothesis that the epistle was written to the Jewish-christians in Palestine, especially at Jerusalem; and Langen[1] has done little to weaken them.

What, then, can be said in favour of Alexandria? More than for Palestine. But whether it can be proved that readers in Egypt were addressed, is not certain. While many considerations seem to countenance that view, they do not carry strong conviction to the mind, and therefore the question is hardly settled. It is favourable to an Alexandrian circle of readers, that Greek was the language used in the synagogues there; that the writer uses the Septuagint in its Alexandrian recension; and that he even brings out of the Old

[1] Theolog. Quartalschrift für 1863.

Testament something not in it, but only in the Greek (xi. 21–28). As it had so great authority there, the author could base his reasoning upon it, notwithstanding incorrectnesses; and allegorise to readers accustomed to such interpretation. The passage also, taken from the second book of Maccabees, an Egyptian work, (Heb. xi. 35–37), tells in favour of Alexandria. Indeed the best commentary on xi. 32–34 is the fate of the Jews at Alexandria under Caligula, described by Philo in his work against Flaccus—persecutions repeated in the year 40, according to the same author.[1] Such scenes must have affected the Jewish-christians there in a less degree. '*They* had not yet resisted unto blood,' as the writer states.[2] The complexion of the epistle would procure for it a ready acceptance among the Jewish-christians there. It must be allowed, however, that these considerations apply to the personality of the writer, as well as the locality of the readers.

The chief argument relied upon on behalf of Alexandrian readers is the description of the temple in vii. 27; ix. 1–5; x. 11, which does not suit the structure in Jerusalem but that in Leontopolis. Thus in vii. 27, the high priest is represented as *daily* offering up sacrifice—first, for his own sins, and then for the people's; and in Philo the same official is said to offer prayers and sacrifices *every day*. But this writer does not assert that the high priest did so in the temple at Leontopolis, or in the most holy place of it. It is therefore impossible to show that the altar of incense stood in the holy of holies in the Egyptian temple, on which the priest offered daily. The deviations of the epistle to the Hebrews from the arrangements of the temple at Jerusalem cannot be identified with the constitution and practices of that at Leontopolis. If it

[1] De legatione ad Caium, in vol. ii. of Mangey's ed.

[2] See Köstlin on the Epistle, in Zeller's Theologische Jahrbücher für 1854, p. 395, *et seq.*

could be shown that the altar of incense stood there in the most holy place, and that the high priest presented a *sin offering* on it daily, the matter would be clear; but Philo does not help us to this. That the temple of Onias, though built after the model of that in Jerusalem, differed from it in various respects, may be inferred from the Talmud and Josephus; but that the divergence of the copy from the original explains why the holy of holies, which was empty at Jerusalem, is said to have contained the ark, with the pot of manna, Aaron's rod, and the tables of stone—the pot of manna and the rod being *in* the ark, not *before* it, and the altar of incense also being *in* the most holy place, not *before* it (ix. 4, 5)—cannot be sustained. All that can be said in explanation is, that the writer, instead of having solely in his mind the sin offering of the high priest on the great day of atonement, mixed up with it the daily sacrifices of the Levitical priests, which might be done the more readily because the Mishna states that the high priest could do it as often as he pleased; and Josephus, that he joined the ordinary priests in their work of sacrifice, on many occasions. But while Wieseler's ingenious arguments connecting vii. 27; ix. 1–5; x. 11, with the temple in Egypt, fail to carry conviction, the loose way in which the writer speaks of the temple arrangements favours the idea, either that his readers were Alexandrian Jewish-christians, or that he himself was one, or both together. What recommends the view of the readers being Alexandrian, as well as the author, is the improbability of Apollos addressing such an epistle to Jewish-christians elsewhere. How could they appreciate or understand his reasoning? Could they follow his spiritualising of Judaism, or his spiritual coincidences of its organic arrangements with Christianity? Even in Alexandria, the majority could scarcely apprehend the argument of the epistle, much less the Jewish believers elsewhere. The cir-

cumstances of the readers must therefore be considered as well as the writer, and the point of contact between them implied in his conceptions of Christianity.

The epistle of Barnabas, which is an Alexandrian production about the beginning of the second century, confirms the view now given of the epistle to the Hebrews. Like the latter, it presents Paulinism in a developed state, and proceeds a step further in the path opened up by the canonical letter. It takes the spiritual sense resulting from the law of typical interpretation, as the abiding truth of the Old Testament, so that the gnosis of Christianity emerges through the letter of the law into a *new* law (chap. x.), and Christianity itself, having abolished the literal acceptation of the law, becomes 'the new law of our Lord Jesus Christ, having no yoke of necessity' (chap. ii.). The path opened up by the epistle to the Hebrews is consistently followed out.

If the view of those who deny the epistolary character of the work were correct, it would be unnecessary to look for a definite circle of readers. But although the theme is treated in the manner of an essay, and the marks of a letter are absent from the beginning, they appear at the conclusion (xiii.). The first epistle of John has no epistolary introduction, and is no less a letter on that account. There are also passages in our epistle showing a regard to the individual and concrete relations of a church (ii. 3; v. 11, 12; vi. 10; x. 25, 32–36; xii. 4). It is clear that it arose out of definite historical circumstances. The writer sustained a well known relation to his readers, whose state and circumstances he describes, blaming them severely for their want of progress, and exhorting to steadfastness. The epistle is unintelligible, if it was not addressed to a single church. Hence it cannot be considered a circular treatise intended for all Jewish-christians. It was meant for a specific community to be sought, probably, in Alexandria. That

it was addressed to the Jewish believers at Rome, as Holtzmann tries to show on the ground of xiii. 24 and of its first appearance there, where it was denied to be Pauline for three centuries, is very improbable.[1] It is not suited to the style of thought which characterised the Jews there, because it has an Alexandrian cast. The apostle Paul had taught at Rome not long before, fixing his conceptions of Christianity deeply in the Christian church: Is it likely that Apollos would soon address the Jewish-christians of the place so differently? If it be said that the Philonian nature of the work is due to the writer not the readers we ask, Would not Apollos, or any Christian of the Pauline type, have given his instructions a form better adapted to the intelligence of his readers? And is it probable, that after Paul's death and the Neronian persecution, a large church, consisting of Jewish-christians mainly, existed at Rome? Were the influences of that capital likely to tempt them back to the old religion? Did Judaism flourish there after the martyrdom of Paul and Peter, and the Neronian persecution? On the contrary, Christianity increased and prevailed, the ancient religion proportionally declining in the esteem of the cultivated. Jewish Christianity kept its ground long after, but Judaism had little attraction for those who thought they had the essentials of it in that type of Christianity which took Peter for its representative.

LANGUAGE.

Almost all believe that the epistle was written in Greek. Very few hold, with Michaelis, its Aramaean original; and there is no reason for repeating his oft-refuted arguments. In favour of its being composed in Greek, we may refer to the style, which has the freedom

[1] See Bunsen's Bibelwerk, vol. viii. p. 532, and Studien und Kritiken für 1859, p. 297, &c.

and ease of an original, to the exclusive use of the Septuagint even in its mistakes, as at i. 6, and ii. 7, where the rendering of the Hebrew Elohim (gods) by *angels*, is taken from the Greek, though the Hebrew word does not bear that sense; to the paronomasias, which though possible in the case of a version, are improbable (v. 8; x. 38, 39; xi. 37; xiii. 14); and especially the double meaning of διαθήκη in ix. 16, 17, which the corresponding Hebrew word does not permit; to the interpretation of the Hebrew terms *Melchizedek* and *Salem* (vii. 2) by corresponding Greek words; and to the fact, that Greek terms appear which could only have been expressed in Hebrew or Aramaean by a circumlocution.[1] The sole argument of weight on the opposite side is derived from the parties supposed to be addressed, Jewish-christians in Palestine, whose vernacular dialect was not Greek but Aramaean. This argument has no force against such as believe that the letter was addressed to the Jewish-christians at Alexandria—an opinion preferable to the other. But even the Jewish-christians of Judea must have understood Greek between A.D. 60 and 70 or earlier. That tongue rapidly acquired currency among all classes in Palestine, and had encroached on the dialect of the Hebrews as the destruction of Jerusalem drew near.

OCCASION AND OBJECT.

The immediate cause of the letter was the state of the Alexandrian Jews, who had embraced Christianity and were in danger of apostatising. In consequence of the hazard they were exposed to, the author addressed them, that they might not waver but be established in the faith. The question was not new. The relative

[1] Compare i. 1, 3; xii. 1, 2; and in ii. 8 the verb ὑποτάσσω; compare also verse 5.

claims of Judaism and Christianity had often engaged the attention of Paul. The writer shows the superiority of the one religion to the other in a conciliatory tone. He does not attack the Jewish economy, but states its use and purport. According to him, it was preparatory and typical. It presented Christianity in shadowy outline. Why then should his readers go back to that which the new religion presents in a better form, and leave the antitype for the type? The Jewish-christians of Alexandria, or at least the cultivated part of them, were more liable to return to Judaism because it had become philosophical and rationalistic in the hands of Philo and others of the same school. Letter had given place to spirit, and allegory had explained away the most objectionable parts of the Old Testament. The need of Christianity seemed less to those who had been born Jews, when they had learned the hidden senses which their leading thinkers attached to institutions and ceremonies outwardly uninviting. In order to prevent their return to the old, the author of the epistle sets forth the new under the Jewish aspect of a priesthood, a spiritual priesthood, with a great high priest unchanging and eternal, ever living to intercede, and ever prevailing with his Father in heaven for the good of his people. Atoning power is centred in him who offered himself once for all, and entered into the true holy of holies as the author and finisher of faith. The essence of the old economy is in the new. Shadow has given place to substance. It would therefore be folly in persons who had tasted the heavenly gift to fall back into a system which is defective and transient. If the law completed nothing, and if Christianity introduced a better hope founded on a new priesthood and not disappointing, why renounce the satisfactory for the weak?

CONTENTS.

The epistle has been variously divided, some separating it into three leading parts, others into two. The latter is preferable i.e. i. 1–x. 18; and x. 19–xiii. 25. The first portion is doctrinal, the second hortatory. Bleek objects to the twofold division as unsuitable, because the nature of the entire epistle is admonitory; observing that the didactic statements of the one part are intersected by admonitions, and that the doctrinal and hortatory in the other are not separated. Yet the didactic element preponderates in i. 1–x. 18; the practical in x. 19–xiii. Without therefore meaning to intimate that the author himself had the division in his mind, the separation at x. 19 is the most convenient. From xiii. 18 to the end is a sort of appendix.

1. To show the superiority of Christianity to Judaism, the writer begins with comparing Christ, the founder of the new economy, to the mediators of the old. As angels took part in the law's promulgation, and Moses was mediator between God and the Israelites, Christ is shown to be more exalted than both. He is the Son of God, the Creator of heaven and earth; whereas angels worship him, and instead of being like him, at the head of the kingdom, are only ministering spirits to the redeemed, employed in executing the commands of a superior. To apply this argument, an admonition is subjoined respecting the greater attention due to the salvation announced by Christ. If neglect of the law given by the mediation of angels could not be tolerated with impunity, much less can disregard of the gospel. In prosecuting the proof of Christ's superiority to angels, he states that the future world or Christianity is not subjected to them but to the Son, as is proved by Psalm viii. But in asserting Christ's dominion, he feels that an objection might arise. We do not see yet all things put under

him; to obviate which he shows why Christ must take a lower station than the angels, and suffer death in it. His humiliation unto death was necessary, in fulfilment of the Divine design to provide an atonement for sin, as he did not come to rescue and redeem angels but men (i. ii.).

The author now compares Christ with Moses the executive head of the old dispensation, and his statement takes the form of exhortation. Look to Christ, he says, who is faithful to God as Moses was, and yet far exalted above him. *He* was counted worthy of greater honour than Moses, as the founder of a community is greater than the community itself. Moses himself was a servant to the founder; Christ was the Son. To this is annexed a warning against unbelief, drawn from the Israelites in the wilderness. Quoting Psalm xcv., he expatiates on the meaning of the passage, showing that the promised rest into which the Israelites could not enter because of unbelief, included a spiritual rest still future. We should therefore strive to enter into that rest; for the word of God, especially his commination, has a living power to seize on and judge the spirit (iii. 1–iv. 13).

Having instituted a comparison between Christ and Moses, and gone off into a warning digression, he considers the former as a high priest, as proposed at the commencement of the 3rd chapter. The proof that he is a high priest begins with a parallel. A human priest appointed for the service of men, partakes of the weaknesses of humanity, and is able to sympathise with erring men by entering into their feelings. As the earthly high priest is appointed by God, so is Christ. His office is not usurped any more than theirs. But the parallel is postponed, the writer introducing the old priestly king Melchizedek, instead of the Levitical high priest. Before he proceeds, however, to compare Christ and Melchizedek, he inserts a hortatory

passage, complaining of his readers' slow understanding, and affirming that they needed instruction in first principles rather than the difficult truths alluded to. But he waives the discussion of elementary doctrine, and advances to the higher truths, justifying that course by the fact that it is impossible to restore the fallen. He thus warns them against apostatising to Judaism, moderating his tone in the end by expressing a wish that they would attain to the full assurance of hope. And to encourage them in this, the example of Abraham is adduced, to whom, as well as to all believers, the promise was confirmed by an oath (iv. 14–vi. 20).

Returning to the point he had left, viz. the representation of Christ's priesthood after the order of Melchizedek, he shows its superiority to the Levitical. It is perpetual, and above the Levitical, because Abraham himself paid tithes to Melchizedek, the less being blessed by the greater. In Abraham all his descendants may be considered as acknowledging Melchizedek's superiority. And if the priesthood be changed, the law too must be changed. The difference of the Christian priesthood is exhibited in descent, and in the power of an endless office, as is testified in Psalm cx. The Mosaic law, which was abrogated, is contrasted with that introduced in its stead. The one was weak and unprofitable, the other introduced a better hope. The Levitical priests were made without an oath; the new priesthood was appointed by an oath. The Levitical line was mortal; Christ lives for ever. The Aaronic priests were sinful and must offer sacrifices both for themselves and the people; Christ is unspotted, and offered himself a sacrifice once for all. Christ is a high priest of the heavenly sanctuary, whose service is superior in proportion as the covenant he established is better. God himself did not regard the first dispensation as permanent or complete, but pro-

mised a better one, as is proved by the Old Testament (vii. 1–viii. 13).

The author reverts to the comparison of the ministrations performed by the high priests under the old covenant and the head of the new, describing the sanctuary with its apartments and furniture, the service of the priests, its symbolical use and unsatisfying nature. But Christ, the high priest of the new covenant, entered once for all into the heavenly sanctuary by means of his own blood, having obtained eternal redemption. If the blood and ashes of beasts had a purifying power, much more has the blood of Christ. If they conferred ceremonial purification, this purifies the conscience. Christ by his death became the founder of a new covenant, and abolished the guilt of sin for ever by the one sacrifice of himself. It was necessary that he should die, for every covenant is ratified by the death of a victim; and accordingly the Mosaic covenant itself was confirmed by the shedding of blood. On the other hand, the sacrifice of the heavenly high priest is a superior ratification, because he appeared once to destroy sin, and will not appear again till he comes without sin. In continuation of the leading idea that Christ took away sin by the sacrifice of himself, the writer affirms that the sacrifices of the law, repeated yearly, could not give perfect peace of conscience, else they would not have been repeated; and proves by Psalm xl., that whereas God takes no pleasure in sacrifice, He wills that we should be sanctified by the offering of Christ's body. Such sanctification agrees with a promise made respecting the new covenant in the book of Jeremiah, that no more sacrifices should be required (ix. 1–x. 18).

2. This portion consists of a great variety of admonitions.

The author exhorts his readers to appropriate the benefits of Christ's priesthood, and to beware of apos-

tasy, since heavy judgments would overtake such as by falling away despised the grace of God. He encourages them to return to their first love, by reminding them of their steadfastness after their conversion, which they should continue to exhibit. The characteristics of faith are briefly stated, with a long series of Old Testament saints exemplifying its power. It is a strong confidence in things hoped for, a conviction of things unseen. The examples of it are taken from the antediluvian period, from the patriarchal age till Moses, from the exodus till the occupation of Canaan, and from that time till the Maccabees. All these, however, did not realise the promised Messiah, while God provided something better for us, that they should not reach completeness without us. The last examples he mentions lead him to enjoin steadfastness, while he refers his readers to such witnesses, as well as to Christ himself. Chastisement is a salutary discipline, appointed by God for his children's good. He counsels peace with all; dissuades from remissness, impurity, and sinful inclination to forsake God. To the solemn warning against apostasy is prefixed a comparison of the way in which God showed Himself to the Israelites at the giving of the law, with the communion of the new covenant into which Christians have entered. Let believers therefore be thankful for the kingdom they have, serving God with reverence and fear (x. 19–xii. 29).

A number of general exhortations follow. Individual virtues are recommended, as brotherly love, hospitality, compassion, chastity, contentment with present things apart from covetousness. The readers should be steadfast in the Christian faith and worship, after the example of their departed teachers, avoiding Judaism, which is inconsistent with a part in Christ's redemption. After enjoining subjection to their pastors, the writer concludes with personal notices; requests an

interest in the prayers of his readers, hoping that he might be restored to them the sooner, and closes with a benediction (xiii.).

The value of this epistle has been variously estimated. Extreme views, like that of Owen, who asserts that 'the world may as well want the sun as the Church this epistle,' are not worth mentioning. The work is inferior to Paul's epistles. The arguments are often weak and inconclusive, mere *argumenta ad hominem*, presupposing a Jewish taste for allegory. The circle of ideas in which the writer moves is too Judaic to commend itself to the cordial acceptance of Christian readers. Thus when it is said that Levi paid tithes to Melchizedek in Abraham, because he was 'yet in the loins of his father when Melchizedek met him;' that the rest promised to the Jews of old did not refer either to the rest which God is said to have taken on the seventh day of creation, or to the possession of Canaan, but to a spiritual rest in heaven; that Psalm cii. 25–27 alludes to Christ, there styled Jehovah; that the patriarchs were animated by the desire of the heavenly Jerusalem; that the vail separating the two apartments of the temple typified the flesh of Christ; that the heavenly sanctuary must be purified with better things than animal sacrifices,—these and many other statements are peculiar to the writer. The entire view given of the old economy and its arrangements, as if they were intended to be types and shadows of Christianity, is a later one, and without a solid foundation. In like manner, the continued efficacy of Christ's priesthood in heaven is an unpauline sentiment, which cannot be accepted as correct. The epistle has too much of the Alexandrian element to be of that high theological importance which belongs to the larger productions of Paul. It is pervaded by a spiritualising Judaism engrafted on Christianity. Hence it has only a moderate interest for the theologian. The best portions are the

practical and hortatory, i.e. from x. 19 to the end. Here a pure and lofty spirit breathes itself forth in encouraging precepts. Promises cheer the mind of the believer; hopes of a glorious reward encourage him. He may come boldly to the throne of grace and suffer joyfully, because his great high priest is in heaven, having been made perfect through sufferings. There is no continuing city here; the Christian seeks one to come. Many such declarations make the epistle most acceptable to the devout mind. But theoretical believers will not find it equally serviceable, though they too may be stimulated by it to run the Christian race with persevering zeal.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1847; Lünemann, 1855; Bleek, 1828–1840; Tholuck, 1850; Ebrard, 1850; Stuart, 1837; and Delitzsch, 1857.

THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES.

A SERIES of epistles, distinct from Paul's, are called *catholic*. They form a peculiar collection, and are seven in number, containing alleged writings of James, Peter, John, and Jude. The origin of the appellation *catholic* is not clear.

An examination of patristic testimony respecting it leads to the following results:—

1. The term *catholic* was originally applied to the first epistles of John and Peter in the sense of *circular*, intended for a wide circle of readers, as distinguished from Paul's which were commonly addressed to particular churches. Thus Clement of Alexandria speaks of the epistle of the apostles to the church at Jerusalem (Acts xv. 22–29) as a *catholic epistle*.[1] Apollonius relates of a Montanist called Themison, that he composed a *catholic* epistle in imitation of the apostle (probably John).[2] Origen speaks of the epistle of Barnabas as a *catholic* epistle.[3] He also refers to Peter's *catholic* epistle, and repeatedly applies the same epithet to the first epistle of John. The epistle of Jude he designates in the same way, but only in passages where the Greek is lost and nothing but a Latin translation exists. Dionysius of Alexandria applies the same expression to John's first epistle.[4]

2. Before Eusebius, probably in the last half of the third century, the epistles of Jude and James, the second

[1] Stromata, iv. 15, p. 606, ed. Potter.
[2] Ap. Euseb. H. E. v. 18.
[3] Contra Celsum, i. 63.
[4] Ap. Euseb. vii. 25.

of Peter, the second and third of John, were added to the other three, forming, with them one collection called *catholic*, because they were read publicly in the catholic or general Christian church. Eusebius does not use *catholic* as synonymous with *canonical* or *apostolic*, any more than his predecessors.[1]

After the time of Eusebius, when the seven were incorporated into the canon and put by the side of the Pauline collection, the appellation began to be gradually identified with *canonical* or *apostolic*, but sooner in the Latin church than the Greek. Hence Junilius speaks of the seven as canonical, meaning *apostolic*.[2] Cassiodorus follows him.[3] Thus the error became rooted in the Latin church that the catholic epistles are canonical or apostolic. Some think that they find a trace of *catholic* gradually becoming equivalent to *canonical* in the Muratorian fragment, but the text is uncertain.[4]

In the majority of ancient MSS. the catholic epistles follow the Acts of the Apostles, preceding those of Paul. Hence Lachmann and Tischendorf arrange them so in their editions of the Greek Testament. The Sinaitic MS. has them immediately before the Revelation, which is the usual position. The first epistles of John and Peter obtained general recognition on the part of the Church, sooner than the rest. Papias and Polycarp received them. The letters of James and Jude, which were considered unapostolic at first and therefore uncanonical were afterwards put with the others, while the second and third of John formed a mere appendix to the rest. When the second of Peter was adopted, it could only be placed after the first, though it was doubted much longer than any of the seven, and has always encountered suspicion.

[1] Hist. Eccles. iii. 3.

[2] De Partibus Legis Divinae, i. 6.

[3] De Institutione Divinarum Scripturarum, c. 8.

[4] Epistola sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur. To *catholica, ecclesia* may be supplied.

THE EPISTLE OF JAMES.

THE AUTHOR.

THREE PERSONS bearing the name of James are mentioned in the New Testament.

First. James the son of Zebedee and brother of John, who was beheaded by Herod Agrippa as related in the Acts, about A.D. 44. He is commonly styled *the greater* or *elder*.

Secondly. James the son of Alpheus is mentioned (Matt. x. 3; Mark iii. 18; Luke vi. 15; Acts i. 13). Mark says that his mother's name was Mary (xv. 40), which Mary is said to be the wife of Cleophas in John xix. 25. Cleophas and Alpheus are probably identical; the former a Hebraising, the latter a Greek form of the same word. This James is usually styled *the less*, either because he was younger than the other, or his stature was less.

Thirdly. Another James is spoken of as *the Lord's brother* (Gal. i. 19; Josephus's Antiq. XX. ix. 1).

Some identify the last two, arguing that a narrative in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as quoted by Jerome, represents James the just, the Lord's brother, as present at the breaking of bread, after the resurrection; that the superscription of the old apocryphal Gospel of James assumes the same view; that Papias, Clement of Alexandria, Jerome, Chrysostom, and Theodoret held their identity; that only two of the name appear in the Acts; that the James who occupies a prominent place in Jerusalem after the death of Zebe-

dee's son, is not distinguished from the son of Alpheus; that he is not specified as one of the Lord's brethren in Acts i. 14; but on the contrary is reckoned among the apostles in Gal. i. 19, according to the most natural explanation of the passage. These and other considerations which have been urged, are not conclusive. They are weakened by the fact, that the identification of the two Jameses is usually accompanied by the belief that James was son of Mary, sister of Mary the mother of Jesus and wife of Cleophas, which is founded on John xix. 25, where Mary, wife of Cleophas, is apparently called a sister of the Virgin Mary. Perhaps, however, the construction does not require this. If four females, instead of three, are spoken of in the passage, the difficulty of two sisters having the same name is removed, and the sister of Jesus's mother is Salome, mother of Zebedee's children. In any case, the Greek word translated *brother*, should not be taken for *cousin* or *relative* (Gal. i. 19), as it is by those who identify James the Lord's brother with the son of Alpheus.

Notwithstanding all that is urged by Lange[1] in favour of the two Jameses being identical, it is more probable that they were different persons. The *earliest* ecclesiastical writers separated them, commencing with Hegesippus, a native of Palestine. Eusebius, Gregory of Nyssa, the Apostolic Constitutions, the Clementines, and the majority of the fathers, held them to be different. In no catalogue of the apostles does James, the son of Alpheus, appear as the Lord's brother. It is true that we read in Gal. i. 19, 'other of the apostles saw I none, save James, the Lord's brother,' words which *appear* to put James, the Lord's brother among the apostles, and so to identify him with the son of Alpheus; but this interpretation is not necessary, for the meaning may be, 'another of the apostles I did not see, except that, in

[1] In Herzog's Encyklopädie.

addition to Peter, I saw James.'[1] This version is possible, as Winer and Fritzsche admit.

Adopting, as we do, the diversity of the two Jameses in question, the Lord's brother was either full brother, or half-brother, to Jesus, for—

(*a*). Such is the natural, primary, obvious signification of the Greek word rendered *brother*, corroborated by its usage in Josephus. No example of its extended application to *cousin* or *relative* can be found in the New Testament. Appeal has been made to Matt. i. 11, where the term is said to mean *uncle*; but that is doubtful. Nor can the fathers be quoted for examples of the tropical sense, since it is very questionable whether the passages in Eusebius,[2] to which Kern and others refer, and one from Hegesippus in the same historian,[3] prove the extended use of the term. Though a wide sense like that of the corresponding Hebrew word be possible, it is without precedent in the New Testament.

(*b*). The *brethren* of Jesus appear in close connection with his mother (Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3; John ii. 12). It is therefore natural to consider them her sons.

(*c*). These brothers did not believe on him (John vii. 5), which was after the time when James, son of Alpheus, had been chosen an apostle.

(*d*). In Acts i. 14; 1 Cor. ix. 5, the *brethren* are distinguished from the apostles.

We believe, therefore, that the brethren of the Lord, James, Joses (Joseph), Simon, Judas, were Jesus's brothers, and that none of them was in the list of apostles. They were not sons of Alpheus, consequently James the Lord's brother is a different person from James son of Alpheus. In what sense were the four, brothers of Jesus? The account given by Epipha-

[1] εἰ μὴ qualifies the whole sentence, and not merely the word ἀποστόλων.

[2] Hist. Eccles. ii. 4; iv. 5.

[3] Ibid. iv. 22.

nius and Theophylact is, that Cleophas and Joseph were brothers. The former dying without issue, Joseph married his brother's widow and had children, agreeably to the Levitical law. James, the first-born, was hence called the son of Cleophas. This is an improbable hypothesis. Many have thought that the four were Joseph's sons by a former wife, an opinion drawn from apocryphal gospels, according to Jerome. It is most likely that the four brethren of Jesus were born after him, being the sons of Joseph and Mary. This agrees with the epithet *first-born* applied to Jesus in Matt. i. 25, which, though erased from the text by Lachmann and Tischendorf, should be allowed to stand, and certainly belongs to Luke ii. 7. If Jesus was the first-born, Mary must have had other children.

It has been objected, that our Lord, before expiring on the cross, committed his mother to the care of John the son of Zebedee. Had James been her son, or even her step-son, it is alleged that Jesus would not have transferred the charge of his mother to one who did not sustain that relation. This argument derives its value from the implied assumption that the brethren had become believers at the time; if they continued to reject his Messiahship, it is not probable that she would have been entrusted to the care of any of them.

There are various allusions to James the Lord's brother in the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's epistles (xii. 17; xv. 13; xxi. 18, &c.; Gal. i. 19; ii. 9, 12; 1 Cor. xv. 7). He occupied a high official station in the church of Jerusalem, having held the office of bishop there, according to tradition. Whether his influence was due to age, personal character, or official position, it is impossible to determine. After the death of Festus the procurator, he suffered martyrdom in a tumult at the temple, as told by Josephus and Eusebius. The exact circumstances of his death cannot be ascertained, though Eusebius occupies a large part of one chapter in

his history with them, quoting Hegesippus, Clement, and Josephus. Josephus's narrative is suspicious, and Hegesippus's is mixed with fabulous materials. Amid the conflicting accounts, one thing is clear, that he was put to death by the unbelieving Jews at the temple in Jerusalem, having been struck with a fuller's pole. He was styled *the just* for his eminent virtue.

Wieseler[1] has laboured to show, that James the son of Alpheus, not James the Lord's brother, was the head of the Jerusalem church. It is thought that *an apostle* should occupy a prominent position in ecclesiastical matters, instead of being ignored in the Acts. Tradition is against this opinion. If an apostle be wanted for the head of the church at Jerusalem, James the less and James the Lord's brother should be identified. Those who separate them, as Wieseler does, and still make the former the prominent one in the Acts, are obliged to distinguish the James of Gal. i. 19, from him of Gal. ii. 9–12.[2]

To which of the three Jameses does the epistle belong?

Not to the first, because the circumstances in which it was written, as gathered from itself, require a later origin. Perhaps also, he died too early to allow of the supposition that he wrote the epistle. Yet the subscription of the old Latin version published by Martianay and Sabatier (ff.), assigns it to him. Probably the subscriptions of the Peshito, in the editions of Widmanstad, Tremellius, and Trost, ascribe it to the same, though they mention no more than *the apostle* James. It must either have been written by, or in the name of James son of Alpheus, or James the Lord's brother. Most of the early fathers attribute it to the latter, an opinion confirmed by the letter itself. The author styles himself *a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ*, not an apostle. We admit that the

[1] In the Studien und Kritiken für 1842, p. 79, etc.
[2] See Bleek's Einleitung, p. 544.

predicate is not inconsistent with apostleship, and that he might refrain from styling himself an apostle, through modesty. Paul calls himself *servant of Christ* in two of his letters (Rom. i. 1; Phil. i. 1); and John speaks of himself as *a servant of God.* But an apostle writing to the Jewish-christians out of Palestine, to the twelve tribes scattered abroad, would strengthen his influence by the epithet. In Palestine it might be dispensed with—out of it, scarcely.

PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED.

According to i. 1, the letter is directed to 'the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad,' i.e. to all the Jews out of Palestine; not to the unconverted but to such as had embraced Christianity, the spiritual Israel in their dispersion. The writer did not intend to address unbelieving Jews or unconverted as well as converted ones, but only the latter. This appears at the very commencement, the words, 'the trying of your faith worketh patience,' implying believers. So also, ii. 1, 'Have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, with respect of persons.' The seventh verse of the 2nd chapter points to the same conclusion: 'Do they not blaspheme that worthy name by the which ye are called?' i.e. the name of Christ, they being *Christians.*

It is inconclusive to argue that the letter was intended for the unconverted as well as the converted Jews because there is only a general salutation at the beginning and no Christian benediction at the end, just as if the writer were Paul. Nor is it correct to interpret the wars and fightings (iv. 1–10) of the mutinies of the Jews, especially the Zealots. Neither was the 3rd chapter intended for Jews as well as Jewish-christians.

We cannot extend the sense of the expression 'the twelve tribes' so far as to make it equivalent to the

'Israel of God' in Gal. vi. 16, i.e. to all Christians Jewish and Gentile, though the true Israel of God embrace them, because the use of the phrase *twelve tribes* is inexplicable if the writer intended all believers without distinction. The author makes no allusion to Gentile converts, nor to the relation between Jew and Gentile incorporated into one spiritual body. With this agrees the use of the word *synagogue* (ii. 2) instead of *church*.

In answer to the questions, Were Jewish-christians out of Palestine numerous, at the time when the epistle was composed? In what country or countries were they? Were they scattered through many lands, or confined to a comparatively limited district? no specific information can be given. There is no authority for limiting the circle of readers, as some have done, to Syria, Cilicia, and the adjacent parts. It is also unwarrantable to include among them Jewish-christians in the Palestinian churches out of Jerusalem, as Hüther is inclined to do. We abide by the view that the letter was professedly written for the benefit of all the Jews out of Palestine who had embraced Christianity.

PLACE AND TIME OF WRITING.

Hug[1] has attempted to deduce the place of writing from certain internal marks, which, in his opinion, clearly point to Palestine. The author's native land was not far from the sea (i. 6; iii. 4), and was blessed with valuable productions, such as figs, oil, and wine (iii. 12). It was exposed to drought; and productions were often scarce for want of rain (v. 17, 18). Sudden devastations of the vegetable kingdom were occasioned by a fiery wind (i. 11). The early and latter rains were familiar (v. 7). These phenomena do not necessarily indicate Palestine, since they existed in many other oriental countries. But if James himself were

[1] Introduction by Fosdick, p. 587.

the writer, Jerusalem was the place whence the epistle issued, since he never left that city, as far as we know, teaching there for many years till he was killed by the Jews. He superintended the affairs of the mother church in the holy city.

As to the *time* of writing, there is great difficulty in finding it, as is evident from the fact that some critics fix it so early as A.D. 44 or 45, others so late as the second century, between which extremes intermediate dates vary. The question is connected with that of the epistle's authenticity; for if the work did not appear till A.D. 64, it was not written by the man whose name it bears, James having been put to death A.D. 62 or 63. It may, however, belong to the apostolic period, though not authentic. The following particulars bear upon and determine the date, more or less definitely.

1. The destruction of Jerusalem, with which the early Christians identified Christ's second coming, was approaching (v. 7, 8), or at hand.

2. In ii. 7 there is an allusion to the name *Christian*. The disciples were called Christians for the first time at Antioch. This makes the date later than Acts xi. 26, or A.D. 44.

3. In ii. 2–4, distinctions of places or seats in Christian churches, an ambitious love of pre-eminence in the meetings for worship, an unworthy partiality for the rich and a neglect of the poor, are inconsistent with an early period. Such outward arrangements and conveniences in places of worship imply a state of organisation which did not exist for a considerable time after churches were formed; an argument not met by the erroneous assumption that the places of meeting for Jewish-christians were then synagogues. The Greek word translated *assembly* (ii. 2) does not mean *the place* of meeting, but the congregation in the place. Nor is it like the freshness and zeal of recent conversion, that rich members should covet outward respect in

regard to seats in congregations; or that the poor should be treated with marked disfavour. Piety had greatly degenerated where this spirit appeared. Amid the worldly views and arrangements which prevailed in these Christian assemblies, early Christian love had grown cold. We must therefore assume a time sufficient to allow of the existence of conveniences in buildings used for worship, of seats comfortable and otherwise, of a spirit of partiality and ambitious selfishness on the part of the rich, contrary to religion. Though human nature is prone to degeneracy, the Jewish converts could scarcely have fallen so far from their first love soon after their adoption of Christianity. Many years would ordinarily be required for such declension. Should it be said that the deterioration is accounted for by the time between Peter's sermon at Pentecost and the date of the epistle, the plea is insufficient, because *all* the Jewish-christians out of Palestine are addressed; and a declension so universal is improbable. Had one or more churches deteriorated, the assumption might be admitted; but the fact of all being in the same circumstances is against the deterioration implied.

In these remarks we assume that though the Jewish term *synagogue* denotes a Christian assembly or church, the use of it does not necessarily show an early period, because it may only imply the stand-point of the writer not an objective relation, or times and churches in which this appellation was retained. Nothing can be inferred from it respecting Jewish-christians still meeting with their unbelieving brethren in the old synagogues—a thing most improbable. We have also assumed, that the *rich* and *poor* spoken of were Christian.

4. The author's argument of faith alone without works is inconsistent with an early date. In the time of Christ and his apostles, a Pharisaic confidence in the fact of possessing the law, apart from a holy life, was the be-

setting sin of the Jews. Had this given way when the epistle was composed? So it appears. The law is never set forth as a ground of righteousness. Justification by it is unmentioned. Either the controversy referred to in the 15th chapter of the Acts had not arisen; or it had been decided. If it had not arisen, is it likely that confidence in the law, to the neglect of a pure life, had ceased? We believe not, else it must be assumed that such confidence was succeeded by reliance on exclusive purity of faith which the Jews carried over into Christianity; an assumption totally baseless, because Paul afterwards combats reliance on the law. Thus a late date alone is correct, one posterior to James himself. As the epistle contains no trace of a scrupulous observance of the Mosaic law on the part of the readers, the controversy respecting the continued obligation of the law, which Paul had carried to a successful issue, had produced its effect on the author's mind. To assert that it had not begun, or that the writer and his readers were agreed about the non-observance of the law, is to oppose all the testimony we have respecting James, who was an observer of the law moral and ceremonial, to the end of life. An early date sets aside the epistle's authenticity, as well as a late one.

5. If it be correct that the author has borrowed Pauline ideas and words, we have so far the evidence of a late date. The phrase *transgressor of the law*[1] is both in Rom. ii. 25, 27 and James ii. 11, the single term *transgressor* being used absolutely in Gal. ii. 18 and James ii. 9; *to fulfil the law*[2] is alike in Rom. ii. 27 and James ii. 8; *doer of the law, hearer of the law*[3] are common to Rom. ii. 13 and James iv. 11, &c., &c.; *fruit of righteousness*[4] is found in Phil. i. 11 and James iii. 18; *be not deceived*[5] is in 1 Cor. vi. 9; xv. 33;

[1] παραβάτης νόμου.
[2] νόμον τελεῖν.
[3] ποιητὴς τοῦ νόμου, ἀκροατὴς τοῦ νόμου.
[4] καρπὸς δικαιοσύνης.
[5] μὴ πλανᾶσθε.

Gal. vi. 7; and James i. 16; *but some one will say*[1] is common to 1 Cor. xv. 35 and James ii. 18; the word rendered *entire*[2] is in 1 Thess. v. 23; the term *members*[3] in James iii. 6; iv. 1, is frequent in Paul's epistles to the Romans and Corinthians; the verb translated *deceiving*[4] in James i. 22 is in Coloss. ii. 4; and the word of God is termed the *perfect law of liberty* (James i. 25), a phrase apparently derived from Paul's ideas of freedom. The apostle of the Gentiles was the first to bring the idea of law over into the department of Christianity in connection with freedom of conscience; and James applies it to the word of God because such transference had been made. It is true that Paul has always a polemic reference to the Mosaic law when he speaks of individual freedom, while a polemic reference does not appear in James; but if the apostle of the Gentiles had already asserted such liberty with triumphant success, so that it could be considered an acknowledged fact, James had no need to make a polemic aspect to the Mosaic law prominent where he speaks of the 'perfect law of liberty.' The phrase implies a recognition of the freedom from that law enjoyed by every Christian, and consequently the priority of the Pauline ministry and writings which were the means of procuring that recognition. The attempt of Brückner [5] to show that the controversy between the claims of law and gospel had not arisen when the author wrote about the freedom of the Christian's law is unsuccessful, as is his whole endeavour to obliterate all marks of the present letter's dependence on Pauline conceptions. The impression made by the coincidences we have given, on an unbiassed mind, leads to the rejection of their independent origin.

6. The doctrine of justification by faith, is presupposed and denied by James. Could he do so without having reference to Paul's exposition of it? We suppose

[1] ἀλλ' ἐρεῖ τις. [2] ὁλόκληρος. [3] μέλη. [4] παραλογίζεσθαι.
[5] In De Wette's Handbuch, iii. 1, p. 200, *et seq.*

not, because the apostle of the Gentiles was the first to bring it forth in all its importance, and hold it up as an essential part of the gospel. It is totally improbable that the writer of our epistle could have spoken of justification as he does, unless an exposition so well known among the Christian churches as to be assumed without special reference to its author had preceded. Not only the expressions *to be justified by faith*, *to be justified by works*, *justification by faith*, *justification by works*, originated with Paul, but he evolved the idea of justification by faith, which cannot be considered a necessary element in the gospel that any of the apostles might have enunciated if occasion required. In other words, the doctrine was not the common property of Christianity from the day of Pentecost, one which Peter as well as Paul might have taught had he been thrown into circumstances where its express assertion against error was necessary; but is traceable to the mind of Paul. Brückner tries to fall back upon the *formulas* of the doctrine as Pauline, not *the thing itself*; but fails to show its extra-pauline claim to be considered an integral part of the gospel. The doctrine and its formulas must go together, both being distinctively Pauline. Huther is more consistent in denying all dependence, whatever be thought of his arguments.

It is unnecessary to show that the doctrine of justification by faith which Paul preached, and that of justification by works which James sets forth, are irreconcilable. The single statement in ii. 24 proves their contrariety: 'Ye see how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only.' Yet their conciliation has been attempted from Calvin's time till the present, either by assuming that Paul speaks of justification before God, James of justification before men;[1] or that the latter refers to faith

[1] 'Paulo esse gratuitam justitiae imputationem apud Dei tribunal: Jacobo autem esse demonstrationem justitiae ab effectis, idque apud homines.—*Calvin in Jacobi Ep.* ii. 21.

as his opponents understood it in the nineteenth verse, and to his own view of it in the succeeding ones. What Paul means by faith is trust in Divine grace revealed in the atoning death of Christ; James understands a theoretical belief which does not become a principle of moral action. The latter does not speak of a state of mind inoperative or passive, for he says that 'faith without works is dead,' implying its non-existence without them. His faith is active in a sense, but is not the motive power of Christian conduct. Paul speaks of faith being sufficient to justify without works, which James denies by saying that a man is not justified by faith *only*; for that Abraham's works not only accompanied his faith, but that the two *wrought together*, *co-operated*, in justification. The contradiction is not obviated by Neander's observations to the effect that Paul looks at the objective-divine, the ground of election by God on which man's trust should rest; James at the subjective-human, which, presupposing the Divine fact whence all proceeds, man must perform on his part.[1] The difficulty still remains. Nor is it removed by showing that James applies the same term to two distinct affections of the soul, the one passive, the other active, as long as it is admitted that the faith predicated of Abraham by both is a state of mind not passive. However plausible Neander's exposition of the views given by James and Paul respectively concerning the justifying power of faith and works may be, it does not harmonise them. If *he* has not succeeded in reconciling what is incapable of agreement, it may be assumed that others must fail. The laboured attempts of Bishops Bull and O'Brien, with the artificial subtleties of Brückner, meet with a repellent power from common sense.

The Pauline doctrine of justification by faith is combated in the epistle. Doubtless it had been abused by

[1] Geschichte der Pflanzung und Leitung u. s. w., zweyter Band, p. 864, vierte Auflage.

many. James opposes the thing itself, not its abuse. Instead of attacking erroneous interpretations which the Jewish converts deduced from Paul's writings, he attacks the real doctrine. The Pauline doctrine of justification was unacceptable to Jewish-christians, whose modes of thinking could not be readily reconciled to it. We know that it was subsequently perverted, the apostle's view of faith being applied erroneously, to the detriment of practical religion. But such antinomianism was not of Jewish origin. It was a Gnostic tendency, a speculative or ideal state of mind having no power over the life.

The polemic anti-paulinism of the passage in James just considered, implies that Paul's writings had been current for a considerable time. He himself had passed off the scene, without effecting the separation of the Jewish-christians from the observance of the law, or detaching them from the doctrine of works in addition to faith, co-operating justification. The Jewish standpoint of the writer is visible, notwithstanding his Christian spirit.

7. It is probable that the example of Rahab in ii. 25, was taken from the epistle to the Hebrews, though Bleek supposes that it may have been handed down orally by Paul and his disciples. If so, the epistle was hardly written before A.D. 67.

The direction to send for the elders of the church, and their use of oil with the prayer of faith, savours of a post-apostolic time. The original function of the elders was *government*; here another is given them. The oil acquires a supernatural efficacy by virtue of their prayer, so as to co-operate in the cure of the diseased. The power of a natural remedy is exalted by the elders' prayer. If there be not a trace of the magical and theurgic here, the writer ascribes to the office-bearers a power not altogether identical with the primitive gift of healing—that of converting prayer

and oil into successful remedial agents of body and soul. Besides, the office of eldership is separated from the members of the church, a thing which did not exist in primitive Christianity; and a cure of souls points to a later period similar to what is implied in 1 Tim. v. 17. Spiritual functions belonged originally to all the members; and the elders were to watch over general orders, maintaining purity of doctrine and practice. Those afterwards called 'pastors and teachers' had the guidance of souls; the office of elder was originally confined to the church's outward guidance.

8. The passage v. 12 agrees with a text in the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which the Clementines[1] also use. But we can hardly suppose that it was taken from that gospel. Christ's words about swearing, as they are recorded in his sermon on the mount (Matt. v. 34–37), were handed down orally, which accounts for their form being a little different in Matthew, James, the Clementines, and the Gospel of the Hebrews. Neither can we believe that the resemblances of certain places to others in the Book of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus, are free citations, though they are so regarded by Theile and Schwegler.[2] The ethical tendency of the works accounts for the resemblances in question. Hence there is no reason for bringing down the origin of the epistle to the time of the apostolic fathers.

9. The fact that the essential doctrines of Christianity, the death of Christ, atonement by his blood, the influence of the Holy Spirit, recede into the background, as they do in the Clementines, does not show a post-apostolic origin, as Kern supposed.

The most probable date appears to be A.D. 68, between the death of Paul and the destruction of Jerusalem, so

[1] iii. 55.

[2] Compare James i. 5, with Sirach xx. 15; i. 12 with Sirach ii. 9; i. 13 with Sirach xv. 11; v. 1 with Wisdom v. 8; v. 6 with Wisdom ii. 20.

that the letter is essentially post-apostolic. That it preceded the council at Jerusalem described in the 15th chapter of the Acts, as Neander and others believe, cannot be accepted.

AUTHENTICITY.

Clement of Rome, Hermas, and Irenaeus, cannot be cited in favour of the authenticity. The first writes to the Corinthians: 'Abraham, called (God's) friend, was found faithful, in that he was obedient to the words of God. . . . Through faith and hospitality, a son was given him in his old age; and by obedience he offered him a sacrifice to God' (compare James ii. 21–23).[1]

Again: 'By faith and hospitality, Rahab the harlot was saved' (compare James ii. 25, and Hebr. xi. 31).[2]

The former passage makes it probable that Clement had read the epistle, the second is uncertain. Others quoted by Lardner and Kirchhofer are doubtful.

It is also supposed that Hermas has alluded to our epistle, in one place at least: 'For if ye resist him (the devil), he will flee from you with confusion' (compare James iv. 7).[3] This testimony is uncertain because the saying was a current one. It may not, therefore, have been taken from James.

But although the passages in Hermas that appear to be reminiscences of our epistle are not decisive, it is very probable that the former was acquainted with the latter, because their point of view is similar. Both look at Christianity in its ethical aspect, separate the rich and poor widely, and present no christology.

Irenaeus seems to have known the epistle when he writes: 'Abraham believed God, and it was counted to him for righteousness, and he was called the friend of God' (James ii. 23).[4]

[1] Ad Cor. c. 10. [2] Ibid. c. 12. [3] Lib. ii. Mandat. xii. 5.

[4] Ipse Abraham . . . . . credidit Deo, et reputatum est illi ad justitiam, et amicus Dei vocatus est.—*Adv. Haeres.* lib. iv. xvi. 2.

It will be observed, that none of these writers refers to the epistle as *Scripture* or *canonical* or *written by James*. Their evidence simply attests the existence of it when they wrote.

The first writer who expressly mentions the writer is Origen: 'For though it be called faith, if it be without works it is dead, as we read in the epistle ascribed to James.'[1]

The word which we have here rendered *ascribed to* is ambiguous and may mean *generally admitted* or *current*, as some suppose. The former sense, however, is confirmed by another place, and is the most probable. It indicates a doubt in Origen's mind whether James really wrote the epistle. In different parts of his works, which exist only in Rufinus's Latin version,[2] the letter is cited as the apostle James's, the brother of our Lord; it is even styled 'the divine epistle of the apostle James;' but such expressions are of doubtful credit, and may be interpolated.

Eusebius states that Clemens Alexandrinus made brief comments on all the catholic epistles.[3] Cassiodorus, speaking of the same, says that he explained the canonical epistles, i.e. the first of Peter, the first and second of John, and the epistle of Jude.[4] It is improbable that Clement commented on *all* the catholic epistles. He has nowhere quoted or alluded to that of James. The fragments of Dionysius of Alexandria are too doubtful to be cited as his, though Hug uses them.

Tertullian never mentions the epistle. The three

[1] Ἐὰν γὰρ λέγηται μὲν πίστις, χωρὶς δὲ ἔργων τυγχάνῃ, νεκρά ἐστιν ἡ τοιαύτη, ὡς ἐν τῇ φερομένῃ Ἰακώβου ἐπιστολῇ ἀνέγνωμεν.—*Comment. in Joann.* tom. xix. (Opp. iv. p. 306.)

[2] Commentary in Ep. ad Rom. lib. iv.—*Opp.* iv. p. 535. Ibid. p. 536, lib. ix. p. 654. Hom. 3 in Psalm xxxvi. p. 671. Hom. 13 in Gen., 3 and 8 in Exod., 2 in Levit.

[3] Hist. Eccles. vi. 14.

[4] Institut. Divin. Litter., c. viii. *Judae* not *Jacobi* is the right reading.

passages given by Lardner and Kirchhofer, bearing some resemblance to parts of James, are insufficient to prove his use of it. And yet he employed all the canonical books of the New Testament, even the short epistle to Philemon. Besides, in his 'Scorpiace,'[1] after citing Peter, John, and Paul, he has nothing from James, though passages in his letter were appropriate. It is still more remarkable that he does not appeal to James v. 16, in his treatise on prayer. Hence he either knew nothing of the epistle; or knowing, rejected it as uncanonical. The latter is the more probable view.

The Muratorian fragment on the canon passes over the epistle.

Eusebius puts it among the antilegomena. His words are: 'But of the controverted, though well known (or approved) by many, are that called the epistle of James,' &c.[2] Elsewhere the historian writes: 'Thus far concerning James, who is said to be the author of the first of the seven epistles called *catholic*. It should be observed, however, that it is reckoned spurious: at least, not many of the ancients have mentioned it,' &c.[3]

These words of Eusebius will bear two meanings. They may express his own opinion about the epistle, viz. that it is spurious; or they may represent the opinion of others in his day, viz. that it was commonly rejected. With Rufinus and others we adopt the latter view, chiefly because the historian quotes the epistle elsewhere as 'the holy apostle's,' and 'Scripture,'[4] phrases inconsistent with the idea of its spuriousness. Yet Eusebius uses the appellation 'apostle' loosely; and

[1] Cap. 8.

[2] Τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα.—*H. E.* iii. 25.

[3] Τοιαῦτα δὲ τὰ κατὰ τὸν Ἰάκωβον, οὗ ἡ πρώτη τῶν ὀνομαζομένων καθολικῶν ἐπιστολῶν εἶναι λέγεται· ἰστέον δὲ ὡς νοθεύεται μέν· οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, κ.τ.λ.—*Ibid.* ii. 23.

[4] Compare Comment. in Psalmos, Psalm c.—*Opp.* vol. v. p. 1244, ed. Migne.

does not attribute the same authority to our epistle as he does to Paul's.

Hippolytus appears to quote the epistle, but not as Scripture or James's: 'for judgment is without mercy to him that has not shewed mercy' (James ii. 13).[1]

Jerome acknowledged the authenticity very clearly: 'James, called the Lord's brother, surnamed the Just, wrote but one epistle, which is among the seven catholic ones; which is also said to have been published by another in his name, though it has gradually obtained authority, in process of time.'[2] Thus while some thought that the letter was written and published by another person in James's name, Jerome himself ascribed it to James.

Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it, as we learn from Leontius of Byzantium.

The Peshito or old Syriac version has the epistle. Hence Ephrem speaks of it as written by James the Lord's brother. The canon of the Syrian church affords important evidence in favour of the epistle's authenticity.

This summary of early testimony is not favourable to the authenticity or canonical authority of our letter. Among the Greeks till the fourth century, its reception was not universal; nor was it approved by many. Afterwards its credit increased, so that in the fifth century it was generally received as canonical. In the Latin church, the epistle was little noticed till the fourth century. Jerome acknowledged its authenticity; and the synod of Carthage, A.D. 397, put it into the canon.

[1] ἡ γὰρ κρίσις ἀνιλεώς ἐστι τῷ μὴ ποιήσαντι ἔλεος.—*Treatise concerning the End of the World and Antichrist*, p. 122. ed. P. A. de Lagarde.

[2] Jacobus qui appellatur frater Domini, cognomento Justus . . . . . unam tantum scripsit epistolam, quae de septem catholicis est, quae et ipsa ab alio quodam sub nomine ejus edita asseritur, licet paulatim tempore procedente obtinuerit auctoritatem.—*Catal. Script. Eccles.* c. 2.

The Latin as well as the Greek church made little use of the work till the fourth century, both being suspicious of its authenticity. The Syrian church received it early.

If the authenticity be feebly supported by external evidence, it is weakly sustained by the internal.

1. The acquaintance it shows with Paul's epistles, especially those to the Romans and Galatians, and above all its polemic aspect towards the doctrine of justification by faith alone, assigns it to a post-apostolic period.

2. The style of writing is too good for James, being pure, elevated, poetical, betraying the influence of Grecian culture. It need not be denied that James was ignorant of Greek though he lived constantly at Jerusalem; indeed a passage in Hegesippus implies his acquaintance with that language, where it is related that the Jews wished James to address the people at the passover, 'because all the tribes have come together, on account of the passover, with the Gentiles also.'[1] But all we know of him, and all that can be reasonably inferred from his education, training, and cast of mind, makes it highly improbable that he could write *such* Greek as that of the epistle. The diction is remarkable for its vivid colouring, its felicitous selection of terms, its oratorical character; which could scarcely proceed from a Jewish-christian like James, who, presiding over the mother church at Jerusalem, thought and spoke in Aramaean.

3. It is not likely that James, the Lord's brother, would have directly opposed Paul's doctrine of justification. He may not have agreed with it, and it is probable he did not. But that he should have written against it, argues a want of respect for the apostle of the Gentiles, incompatible with James's official position and the recognition of Paul's mission to the heathen world.

[1] Ap. Euseb. H. E. ii. 23.

4. The essential doctrines of Christianity, such as atonement by the death of Jesus, his resurrection, the influence of the Holy Spirit, &c., are wanting in the epistle. It has no christology, though Pfeiffer and Huther are anxious to find one in i. 1; neither are distinctive Christian doctrines implied in iv. 5, and v. 14, as the latter supposes. Had James written it, we should naturally expect some mention of Christ's resurrection, at least. But no distinctive Christian doctrine appears, not even the fact that Jesus approved himself the Messiah by his death and resurrection. On the other hand, the Mosaic law, circumcision, the distinction of meats, &c., are passed over, and the royal law of liberty is exalted. Gross Jewish characteristics do not appear; and individual freedom rises above legality. The writer had therefore attained to a subjective stand-point beyond James's; to ideas of Christian liberty like the Pauline, though not in that form. The true Ebionite position, such as we may suppose James's to have been at first, is abandoned or modified; and a Pauline element has got in, carrying it a stage onward. The author has advanced as far as Paul in an ethical direction, not in a doctrinal one. This does not suit a man like James, who never separated Christianity from Judaism as far as we can discover, considering it a more spiritual form of the latter; who did not renounce circumcision and other Jewish observances, but continued in undeveloped Jewish Christianity. Although therefore the statement of Christian doctrine is incomplete as well as imperfect, and the writer's point of view more Jewish than Christian, he occupies a spiritual stage in Jewish Christianity, which James the Just scarcely reached—a stage to which Paul's teaching contributed, consciously or unconsciously.

5. The letter is professedly addressed to all Jewish-christians out of Palestine. But were there churches composed of such members? All were made up of

Jewish and Gentile believers; the larger proportion being Gentiles. Churches were of a mixed character, except in Palestine. Wiesinger therefore may well ask, Where shall we look for the Jewish-christians out of Palestine which will satisfy the requirements of the epistle? a question not answered by reference to Acts ii. 5–11; xi. 19, &c., because the passages are far from implying the extensive establishment of Jewish-christian churches immediately after Pentecost, even if the accounts were literally exact. The earliest history contains no clear trace of such churches widely scattered through the lands; but enough against their multiplication. Does not another writer than James betray himself here, in addressing Jewish-christians solely, who were so incorporated with Gentile ones in the churches that an epistle could not reasonably find them alone? De Wette, however, understands 'the twelve tribes scattered abroad,' to mean all Christians out of Palestine; and removes the incongruity. And how did James become acquainted with the state and temptations of the Jewish-christians scattered through many lands and incorporated with many Gentile churches? Were they in the habit of visiting Jerusalem to keep the feasts, so that he could learn in that way? Those in Syria, Cilicia, and the parts adjacent may have gone up to the metropolis; the majority, scattered through more distant lands, did not. The head of the Jerusalem church could have got little definite information from the strangers visiting his city, comparatively few as they were. In any case, the writer does not convey the impression that his knowledge of their condition was minute or specific, for his language is general, such as a later author writing in his name would employ; nor is his relation to them ever alluded to. The link between them, as far as the epistle shows, is loose.

These observations tend to a conclusion unfavour-

able to the letter's authenticity. It appears to us to have been written after James's death, in his name, by a moderate Jewish-christian or Ebionite. At the time of its appearance the Jewish element in Ebionitism had lost its original roughness; though the practical tone constituting its basis still remained. The refining nature of the Pauline spirit is perceptible in its Ebionitism. This modified Jewish-christianity need not be carried into the second century and the circle of the Clementine homilies. That there are parallels between these homilies and our epistle, cannot be denied.[1] The origin and object of the apocryphal production lead to points of resemblance. But there are marked differences also. Ingenious, therefore, as Schwegler's reasoning is,[2] it does not prove that the epistle was written in James's name, in the second century. The production is a post-pauline one, purporting to proceed from the Lord's brother the head of the Jerusalemite church, and composed shortly before the destruction of Jerusalem.

LEADING OBJECT.

The object of the writer was to admonish the readers, to censure the errors connected with their Christian life, and to console them in adverse circumstances. They were guilty of improprieties. Their faults needed rectification. Hence they are reproved. They were exposed to outward trials and suffering from oppression. Hence he exhorts them to be patient and steadfast, maintaining their trust in the divine word amid discouragements. His object was therefore to reprove, comfort, exhort, and encourage. Aware of the general circumstances affecting them and the errors they had committed, he addresses them in a practical style.

[1] A collection of them is given by Kern, der Brief Jacobi u. s. w., p. 56, *et seq.*

[2] Schwegler, Das nachapostolische Zeitalter, vol. i. p. 13, *et seq.*

It is impossible to discover any definite circumstance of an outward kind, which led the unknown author to write in James's name. One part of the epistle only is polemic (ii. 14–26). The rest is commonly corrective and conciliatory. Everything personal and individual is absent from the letter. It deals in generals, because James writing from Jerusalem to Christians scattered abroad, could have known little of them except in a general way. Doubtless the author's motive was good. From a Jewish-christian stand-point he speaks with authority to the brethren, reproving them freely for their worldliness, and exposing their faults.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE WRITER AND HIS READERS.

The nature of the epistle is peculiar, forming a contrast to Paul's writings. The position of the writer is Jewish rather than Christian. Believers are genuine Jews. The ideas are Christian, but have a Jewish colouring, and are cast in a Jewish mould. Christian doctrine is not exhibited fully. The very name of Christ occurs but twice (i. 1; ii. 1). The Christian ideas of the epistle appear isolated; and the atonement of Christ is scarcely touched. Thus we see little more than the threshold of the new system. It is the teaching of a Christian Jew, rather than of one who had reached a high apprehension of the doctrines and motives constituting the essence of Christ's religion. There is an imperfect doctrinal development. It is only necessary to read the entire epistle to perceive the truth of these remarks. In warning his readers against transgression of the law by partiality to individuals, the author adduces Jewish, not purely Christian motives (ii. 8–13). The greater part of the 3rd chapter respecting the government of the tongue, is of the same character, in which Christ's example is not once alluded to, the illustrations being taken from objects in nature. The

warning against uncharitable judgment does not refer to Christ, or to God who puts his Spirit in the hearts of believers; but to the law (iv. 10–12). He who judges his neighbour, judges the law. The exhortation to feel and act under constant remembrance of the dependence of our life on God, belongs to the same category (iv. 13–17). He that knows good without doing it, is earnestly admonished to practise virtue and to avoid self-security, without reference to the motives connected with redemption. Job and the prophets are quoted as examples of patience, not Christ; and the efficacy of prayer is proved by the instance of Elias, without allusion to the Redeemer's promise (v. 17). The epistle is wound up after the same Jewish fashion; though the opportunity of mentioning Christ, who gave himself a sacrifice for sin, presented itself naturally.

The very method in which the author writes is Hebraistic. His sentences are short and weighty, like the proverbial sayings of the Jews. Their connection is feeble, one following another without a clear link of union. Even when a subject is treated more fully than usual, an epigrammatic sentence closes it (i. 5–8, 13–16, 22–27; ii. 1–13, 14–26; iii. 1–5, 6–8, 13–18; iv. 1–10, 13–17; v. 7–10). The author's mode of proof is by the law and by examples occurring in the Old Testament. He is a spiritual Judaist.

The phenomena of the epistle have been explained in two ways, on the assumption of its authenticity. With Neander, some believe that James remained in the narrow circle of doctrinal ideas here unfolded, and that he could do little more than conduct his countrymen from the old dispensation to the new. A teacher of the Jewish rather than the Christian system, he was unable to instruct men in Christian knowledge so that they could have anything like a comprehensive view of it. Others believe that James adapted his method of instruction to the persons addressed, because their know-

ledge was elementary and they could not bear advanced doctrines. Neither explanation accounts satisfactorily for the character of the epistle, as we might easily show, if it were necessary for such as reject the authenticity.

From the Jewish-christian stand-point of the writer, which is not in its elementary stage, arises the resemblance of many sentiments in the epistle to the sermon on the mount. The discourses of Jesus being ethical not dogmatic, representing a purified and enlarged Judaism, the sentiments and language of the letter approaches them. By comparing James i. 5, 6 with Matt. vii. 7, xxi. 22; ii. 5 with Matt. v. 3; ii. 8 with Matt. xxii. 39; ii. 13 with Matt. vii. 1, 2; iii. 1 with Matt. xxiii. 8–14; iii. 12 with Matt. vii. 16; iii. 18 with Matt. v. 9; v. 12, 13 with Matt. v. 34–37, their agreement is at once perceived. The writer did not quote the written gospel of Matthew as a well-known document. No passage in the epistle exhibits a clear reference to the first gospel; and the attempts to find any are unavailing. The teachings of Christ were known by oral tradition rather than written forms; and the point of view taken by an Ebionite writer must be substantially like that embodied in the precepts of Christ, the early, simple, practical, spiritualised Judaism, not the dogmatic, Pauline system, presenting a later and remote development of the old religion.

The picture of the Jewish-christians is not minutely drawn, but consists of a few general strokes, wanting specific colouring. Graphic as far as it extends, it is neither definite nor complete. The believers presented the following features.

1. They had comfortable places of assembling for worship, and elders presiding over the congregations. Teaching was not yet restricted to these office-bearers, since many were eager to instruct their brethren (ii. 2, 6, 7; v. 14; iii. 1).

2. They were commonly poor, though there were

also several rich among them who were elated with their condition (i. 10, 11).

3. Hence they were oppressed in various ways by the rich. Under the weight of privations and persecutions, they were inclined to shield themselves from responsibility by pleading the power of outward temptations, which they ascribed to God's providence (i. 11–13; ii. 6; v. 8–11).

4. In their assemblies they showed partiality to the rich, making distinctions on account of differences in worldly station, to the prejudice of Christian love (ii. 1–6, 8–13).

5. Their hearts were not deeply penetrated by the power of religion. Their hopes were sensuous. They were largely under the dominion of worldly lusts and inordinate desires. They showed violence of temper, sought to effect their object by contention, were envious, uncharitable, censorious; and did not put that restraint on their language which prevented swearing in ordinary conversation. Their hearts, in short, were too much set upon the world (i. 19–21; iii. 10–18; iv.; v. 12).

6. Besides violating the law of love, they overvalued faith to the neglect of works, contented with an assent to the truth of Christianity, which left their hearts unchanged, and produced no real fruits in the life (ii. 14–26).

7. They were also too forward to assume the office of religious teachers, many pressing into that duty, who had no proper control over their tongue, or right views of their responsibility (iii. 1, &c.).

LANGUAGE AND STYLE.

The epistle was not translated from an Aramaean original, but was composed in Greek, and shows a good acquaintance with this language on the part of the

author. The words employed are generally pure, select, and appropriate. There are few Hebraisms. It is difficult to account for such Grecian purity in one who resided at Jerusalem all his life, and did not take the free direction of Paul with regard to Christianity. Occasionally, however, there is an artificial air about the style, and an absence of that easy flow which bespeaks a perfect mastery of language. There are some peculiar and unusual expressions, as the term translated *ways* (i. 11);[1] the participle rendered *of his own will* (i. 18);[2] the phrase *when ye fall into divers temptations* (i. 2);[3] *shadow of turning* (i. 17);[4] *he begat* (i. 18).[5] The most prominent feature of the author's style is its graphic liveliness and oratorical cast, exemplified by numerous comparisons and metaphors, the accumulation of predicates, verbs, and interrogatives. There are even genuine poetical expressions, as in i. 14, &c.; iii. 5, &c.; v. 1, &c., where the imagery is luxuriant. The composition may be characterised as a whole by sententiousness; the diction by elegance and fitness. As to the hexameter in i. 17, it has nothing to do with the reading of Greek verses or the citation of Christian hymns; the words flowed forth unconsciously, as sometimes happens to good prose writers. Our author was familiar with the Hebrew prophets; and his manner, which is bold, aspiring, vigorous, resembles theirs. His denunciations are powerful, his strokes nervous and weighty, so that he becomes sublime at times.

Bishop Jebb adduces many examples of parallelism from the epistle, showing its likeness to Hebrew poetry, and traces the train of thought with much ingenuity, representing James as a logician and poet together.[6]

[1] πορεῖαι.
[2] βουληθείς.
[3] ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις.
[4] τροπῆς ἀποσκίασμα.
[5] ἀπεκύησεν.
[6] Sacred Literature, &c. § xiv. p. 273, *et seq.*

These refined speculations have no proper basis. The parallelisms and logical connection are often imaginary. Persuasive ethical composition, with a style often poetical, is presented in the epistle; but the prevailing characteristic is not the poetical, and the logician is absent.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The letter does not admit of formal division, being without plan or order. Hence the same ideas are repeated. The writer passes rapidly from one topic to another, returning at intervals to his main purpose without logical connection. We divide the work into a succession of paragraphs, in the following manner:—

(*a*). The inscription and salutation (verse 1).

(*b*). An exhortation to the readers to take joyfully their privations, sufferings, and poverty; to be steadfast under them, and to aim at Christian perfection, even through such discipline (i. 2–4).

(*c*). Placed in trying circumstances, they are exhorted to ask wisdom from God without doubting, firmly relying on his mercy (i. 5–8).

(*d*). The joy referred to before in the midst of their trials, would be experienced in the state of their own minds, in their inward consciousness; and they should receive the reward of steadfastness, after their trials, in a crown of life (i. 9–12).

(*e*). Should privations and sufferings tempt to evil, the fault must not be imputed to God the Father of lights, the giver of all good gifts, but to themselves and their sinful lusts (i. 13–18).

(*f*). He exhorts his readers to appreciate the word of God more and more; and not only to hear, but to practise it (i. 19–27).

(*g*). He censures them because of their partiality towards the rich in their assemblies for worship, and

their contempt for the poor, which is a violation of the great law of love; a law he exhorts them to observe (ii. 1–13).

(*h*). As faith should not be without love, so it should not be without works, the author refuting the persons who alleged that they had faith while showing no evidence of it in the life, and supposing themselves justified by faith alone (ii. 14–26).

(*i*). A warning is now introduced against forwardness in assuming the office of religious teachers, since a great responsibility is incurred by every one who attempts to guide and instruct others. This leads the author to speak of the frequent abuse of the tongue. One should show his wisdom by meekness and humility, not by litigiousness. There is an earthly and a heavenly wisdom; the former alone appearing where strife and envying are; the latter, accompanied with purity and peace (ch. iii.).

(*j*). Evil passions are condemned as the source of contention and violence (iv. 1–3).

(*k*). A solemn warning follows, and an exhortation to repentance, addressed to the worldly-minded and sinners (iv. 4–10).

(*l*). The writer condemns detraction and censoriousness (iv. 11, 12).

(*m*). He censures forgetfulness of dependence on God, by showing the irreligious confidence in worldly undertakings displayed by many (iv. 13–17).

(*n*). Here is a threatening against the rich, who, abandoning themselves to every gratification, had deprived the innocent of the means of subsistence (v. 1–6).

(*o*). Christians suffering from the oppression of the rich are exhorted to patience, and comforted with the idea of the Lord's near approach (v. 7–11).

(*p*). We have now a dissuasive against swearing in conversation (v. 12).

(*q*). Prayer is recommended in a variety of situations (v. 13–18).

(*r*). The epistle concludes with the importance and blessedness of endeavouring to reclaim an erring brother from the evil of his ways (v. 19, 20).

The letter has no proper termination, but ends abruptly and unusually, without an apostolic benediction.

The epistle, though occupying a subordinate place in the canon beside the Pauline writings, is full of valuable lessons. The spirit of it is healthy, the views taken of life eminently Christian. All is referred to God, the great author and upholder of the world. Its practical tone is a preservation against the Pauline element in excess, or that one-sided antinomianism which relies on faith, to the neglect of works. The precepts breathe a sound morality, which needs to be upheld against the doctrinal and speculative element for which Paul's epistles are quoted. A production whose fundamental views associate divine causality with the steadfastness of an active and pure life, may well rebuke that theoretical religion which relies on dogma for acceptance with God.

Luther's judgment of its value is expressed with his usual energy. 'In comparison with the best books of the New Testament, it is a downright strawy epistle, is not an apostolic production, ascribes directly justification to works, contrary to Paul and all other Scripture, makes no mention of the sufferings, resurrection, and Spirit of Christ, and throws one thing into another without order.' The result he arrives at is, that the writer lived long after Peter and Paul. The spiritual instinct of the reformer appears in some of these statements. He is right in saying that it is not evangelical or apostolic from a Pauline point of view; and that it contradicts the apostle of the Gentiles in relation to the doctrine of justification. But it is a valuable letter notwithstand-

ing, because dogmatics do not constitute, of themselves. the essence of Christianity, whose ethical side is as important as the speculative. Doctrines are but opinions—ethics, spirit and life.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1865; Huther, 1858; Wiesinger, 1854; Kern, 1838; and Cellerier, 1850.

THE REVELATION.

AUTHORSHIP.

THE prevailing opinion has always been that John the apostle, the son of Zebedee, wrote the book of Revelation. In favour of this view both internal and external arguments are advanced, of which we propose to give a summary.

1. External.

Here some begin, as Hengstenberg does, with Polycarp the apostle's disciple, who writes in the epistle to the Philippians: 'Let us therefore so serve him with fear and all reverence, as he himself hath commanded, and as the apostles who have preached the gospel unto us, and *the prophets who have foretold the coming of our Lord*, being zealous of what is good,' &c.[1] According to Hengstenberg, the prophets are not personally different from the apostles, the apostle John in the Apocalypse being their representative.[2] We believe that the Old Testament prophets are spoken of.

The most ancient testimony for the authenticity of the Apocalypse comes to us indirectly. Two Cappadocian bishops, probably belonging to the fifth century, Andrew and Arethas, relate that Papias looked upon

[1] Οὕτως οὖν δουλεύσωμεν αὐτῷ μετὰ φόβου καὶ πάσης εὐλαβείας, καθὼς αὐτὸς ἐνετείλατο, καὶ οἱ εὐαγγελισάμενοι ἡμῖν ἀπόστολοι, καὶ οἱ προφῆται, οἱ προκηρύξαντες τὴν ἔλευσιν τοῦ κυρίου ἡμῶν· ζηλωταὶ περὶ τὸ καλόν, κ.τ.λ.—*Chapter* 6.

[2] Die Offenbarung des heiligen Johannes, vol. ii. 2, p. 98.

the book as *inspired* and *credible*,[1] which was at that time tantamount to a belief of its apostolic origin. It is true that Papias does not speak of it as the work of John the apostle in express terms; but it is a fair inference that his regarding it as of *divine authority* and *credible*, comports best with the idea of its being written by none other. We may admit with Eusebius, that Papias was not the hearer of John the apostle but of John the presbyter, especially as he himself intimates thus much, and at the same time cites him as a good witness for the apostolic authorship of the Apocalypse. It has seemed singular that Eusebius omits the testimony of this early writer. But his silence is capable of an easy explanation. The historian disliked Papias because of the millennarian views he held, and calls him weak-minded on that account. The extravagant expectations of John the elder's hearer and his day were probably derived from oral tradition, in the opinion of Eusebius; or if they were not, Dionysius of Alexandria had influenced the historian, leading him to doubt the authenticity of the book. One thing is clear, that Eusebius would not have omitted all mention of Papias relative to the point, had the latter expressed himself hesitatingly on it. This he did not; for he belonged to a country where he had good opportunities of knowing the origin of the book, as well as the presbyter John himself to whom Dionysius ascribes it.

The testimony of Melito agrees with Papias's. Eusebius says that he wrote a book 'about the devil and the Apocalypse of John.'[2] The fact that the bishop of Sardis, one of the cities to which an epistle is addressed in the introductory part of the Revelation, wrote on the book, goes far to prove its apostolicity.

Justin Martyr is the earliest writer who expressly attributes the work to John the apostle at Ephesus.[3] It

[1] *θεόπνευστος* and *ἀξιόπιστος*. [2] H. E. iv. 26.

[3] Dialog. p. 308, ed. Colon.

is true that Rettig tries to impugn the authenticity of the passage in Justin; but without effect, as Lücke and Schott show. Eusebius states that Justin wrote his Dialogue or Disputation with Trypho, in which the passage about the Apocalypse occurs, at Ephesus, the first of the seven cities to which the author addressed an epistle (Rev. i. 11; ii. 1). Surely the worthy father must have known the authorship well, by historical tradition. In the circle within which he lived and acted, Justin knew of none other than the apostle as author. We conclude, therefore, that before the middle of the second century, the opinion that John the presbyter was the writer, had not originated. There is no reason for thinking that Justin rested on exegetical grounds; neither time nor place agrees with the assumption. The earliest Christian period relied more on persons than writings for the support of their faith.

Not long after Justin, Apollonius, a presbyter at Ephesus, drew proofs from the Apocalypse against the Montanists, as Eusebius states.[1] The context of the passage in which the historian speaks of him leaves no room for doubt that Apollonius used the book as the production of John the apostle.

Irenaeus is also a witness for the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse, appealing to ancient MSS. for the genuineness of the number 666, as well as to persons who had seen the apostle John.[2] This testimony has great weight, because Irenaeus must have learnt the truth about the writer in proconsular Asia, before he went to Gaul, and the seven churches would carefully preserve a document addressed to them. We do not see that the witness of Irenaeus is weakened by the fact that he was mistaken in dating the book at the end of Domitian's reign; or because he received superstitious and absurd accounts of John from the presbyters who professed to have seen him. It is probable that the

[1] Euseb. H. E. v. 18. [2] Advers. Haeres. v. 30.

father derived the late date he assigns to the Apocalypse from a false interpretation of itself, or from vague report. And as to the superstitious opinions of John received from the elders, they have nothing to do with the composition of a work like the present, because they were deduced from the interpretation of places in the Old Testament.

The epistle of the churches of Lyons and Vienne given by Eusebius,[1] also presupposes the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse; so that from Asia Minor to Gaul the book is well attested as John's in the second century. Tertullian uses it as apostolic,[2] showing that Africa participated in the historical tradition that prevailed in other countries. The Muratorian list ascribes the work to John.

The want of one witness at the end of the second century, or beginning of the third, is suspicious at first sight, viz. the Syriac translation. The Apocalypse is absent from the Peshito. Nor did this old version admit the book afterwards, though scholars in the Syriac church subsequently put it on a level with the rest of the New Testament. A later Syriac translation of the Apocalypse appeared, which was never thought to be equal in authority to what the Peshito would have been considered, had the latter existed. It is true that Hug and others suppose the Peshito to have had the book at first, but this is certainly incorrect. How then is its exclusion from this ancient version to be accounted for? Perhaps by this, that when the Peshito was made, the Apocalypse had not found its way to Edessa the birthplace of the version.

It is certain that Theophilus of Antioch, at the end of the second century, accepted the book as apostolic.[3] In the same century also the Alogi ascribed it to Cerinthus. Caius of Rome, from opposition to Montanism,

[1] H. E. v. 1. [2] Contra Marcion. iii. 14. [3] Euseb. iv. 24.

ventured to make the same statement, as a fragment of Proclus's, preserved by Eusebius, asserts: 'But Cerinthus, by means of revelations which he pretended to have been written by a great apostle, falsely introduces wonderful things to us, as if they were shown him by angels,' &c.[1] This passage has given rise to discussion, some affirming that the revelations spoken of do not mean the present Apocalypse, but *forged revelations* as a counterpart to it. We agree with Lücke, against Paulus and Hug, in referring it to the former.

Marcion and his followers excluded the book from their canon, and therefore rejected its apostolic authorship. This arose from their peculiar tenets, and is of no weight as evidence.

When we pass to the third century, the evidence for the apostolicity of the book is most favourable. Clement of Alexandria[2] ascribed it to John, as did Origen,[3] notwithstanding his opposition to millennarianism. Cyprian, Lactantius, and Methodius were of the same opinion. Hippolytus of Ostia probably wrote a commentary on the Apocalypse, directed against the Montanists. This is inferred from a statement of Ebedjesu respecting him: 'St. Hippolytus, martyr, and bishop, composed a work concerning the dispensation . . . . and an apology for the Apocalypse and Gospel of John the apostle and evangelist.'[4]

Critical doubts began with Dionysius of Alexandria, owing, as it would seem, to doctrinal disputes with the millennarian adherents of Nepos. This father ascribes the work to John the presbyter, not to the apostle. He

[1] Ἀλλὰ καὶ Κήρινθος, ὁ δι' ἀποκαλύψεων ὡς ὑπὸ ἀποστόλου μεγάλου γεγραμμένων, τετραλογίας ἡμῖν ὡς δι' ἀγγέλων αὐτῷ δεδειγμένας ψευδόμενος ἐπεισάγει, κ.τ.λ.—Ap. *Euseb. H. E.* iii. 28.

[2] Stromata, lib. vi. p. 667; and ii. p. 207.

[3] Ap. Euseb. H. E. vi. 25; and Comment. in Joann. *Opp.* vol. iv. p. 17.

[4] Assemani in Bibliotheca Orientalis, vol. iii. part i. p. 15.

bases his opinion on internal grounds, on style, language, and characteristic peculiarities, arguing from the differences of the fourth gospel and first epistle general of John, that the same person could not have written the Apocalypse also.[1] His reasoning has a subjective value merely, and is valid on the assumption that the gospel and first epistle proceeded from the apostle. But it has no worth as an independent historical testimony, because it contradicts the current of ecclesiastical tradition. When Dionysius appeals to *some* of his predecessors who rejected the book and thought it should be excluded from the canon, he could only have alluded to the few who looked upon it as the work of Cerinthus, to Caius, the Alogi, and other antimontanists.

In the fourth century Eusebius[2] seems undecided about retaining or rejecting the Apocalypse. His opposition to millennarianism inclined him to the latter course, not less than the critical doubts of Dionysius. On the other hand, a constant and firm tradition was arrayed on behalf of the apostolicity. The historian conjectures with Dionysius, that the writer may be John the presbyter; but affirms that he will not refuse to put it among the *acknowledged* books, if cause for doing so should appear.[3] This wavering policy tells unfavourably on behalf of his honesty as a historian; since it is not improbable that he could have cited older witnesses for the apostolic authority of the book, had he been so disposed.

It is scarcely necessary to follow the series of external testimonies further than Eusebius. Later witnesses belong to the history of the canon, rather than to criticism. Enough has been given to prove that the apostolic origin of the Apocalypse is as well attested as that of any other book in the New Testament. How can it be proved that Paul wrote the epistle to the Galatians, for example, on the basis of external evidence, if it be

[1] H. E. vii. 24, 25. [2] Ibid. iii. 25. [3] εἴγε φανείη.

denied that the apostle John wrote the closing book of the canon? With the limited stock of early ecclesiastical literature that survives the wreck of time, we should despair of proving the authenticity of any New Testament book by the help of ancient witnesses, if that of the Apocalypse be rejected.

Let it not be urged that the patristic tradition is not unanimous; and that little weight attaches to the testimonies of the fathers, discordant as they often are on topics which came under their notice. The historical tradition relative to the Apocalypse seems to have been interrupted by doctrinal views alone. Had no Montanism or millennarianism appeared, we should have heard of no voice raised against John's authorship. We do not deny that the ecclesiastical writers of the first three centuries occasionally adopted vague traditions without enquiring whether they rested on a good foundation; and that they were generally incapable of critical investigation if not disinclined to it; or that they often followed their immediate predecessors, contented to glide down the ecclesiastical stream without examining the ground of their belief. There were noble exceptions; and it is an undoubted fact, that from the middle of the second century, several distinguished fathers connected with the church in Asia Minor, who had excellent opportunities of knowing the truth of the prevailing tradition there, received the work as an authentic document of the apostle John. Even Clement and Origen, whose doctrinal views did not agree with the book, received it as apostolic. The basis of the tradition cannot be explained away without violating the principles of historical evidence.

2. Internal evidence.

Does internal evidence coincide with external, as regards authorship? In four places John calls himself the author (i. 1, 4, 9; xxii. 8); sometimes without a predicate, at other times with the phrase *servant of*

Jesus Christ; or, *your brother and companion in tribulation, and in the kingdom and patience of Jesus Christ*, in relation to his readers; while in xxii. 9 he is styled by the angel a *fellow-servant* and *brother of the prophets*. He presents himself in the character of a man well known to the Christian churches of proconsular Asia—an influential personage, of whose divine mission they could have no reason to doubt. The predicates attributed to him show a consciousness of dignity, yet a modesty withal, arising from a sense of the union subsisting among true Christians. Though he does not call himself *an apostle*, he is commanded to write what he had seen, and *to send* it to the seven churches (i. 11). He is *the prophet* not *apostle* of the Messiah, in this instance. There was no apparent necessity for the writer to designate himself *an apostle*; because the epithets accompanying the name sufficed to indicate his person. He was the direct witness of the Messiah, the announcer of the revelations of God, the prophet of the new covenant. Like Daniel, he speaks of himself, *I John*. He treats of the apostolic time, when Jewish ideas prevailed, and the expectation of Messiah was fresh in the general mind. When he wrote, several apostles were living, and probably near the sphere where John himself acted. No other man of that time could lay claim to the position and privileges which the writer asserts. Contemporary apostles would have frowned upon the work; John himself would have disowned it. A book bearing his name, and composed thirty years before his death, would have certainly called forth a contradiction, because he knew that it would be taken for his; and such contradiction would have reached us from the circle of his disciples, through Irenaeus. The later assertions of its non-apostolic authorship arose from doctrinal interests. None of them, as far as we can judge, sprung from historical tradition.

Do the contents agree with the assumption that the

book proceeds from an apostolic man; or do they present phenomena inconsistent with the known character of John, and the time when he wrote? To answer this question, we must take a general survey of the contents. These are certainly apostolic, chiefly the eschatology (doctrine of the last things) of the book, which is its prominent feature. When we read the New Testament, it is easy to observe the deep impression which the idea of their Lord's speedy coming had made upon the minds of the apostles. He was to appear in the clouds of heaven with great power and glory, like the Messiah in Daniel. The near approach of this event was the animating and consolatory motive held out in the apostolic epistles. It was present to the mind of Paul, who proclaims Maran-atha; speaks of the Lord's coming with all his saints; of his descending from heaven with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God; believes that *the day of the Lord*—equivalent to *the day of Jesus Christ*, *that day*, *the day of redemption*—is at hand; and that he should live to see it. Then should the saints be judges of the world, and even of angels. Because of its nearness the apostle exhorts his readers to watchfulness. Now Paul assures us that he received nothing from the other apostles, but that all his Christian ideas came from immediate revelation; which shows that the eschatological element in Matthew's gospel and the Apocalypse, was an essential part of primitive Christianity. Nor is it confined to Paul's epistles. It appears in the letter to the Hebrews; Peter's epistles teach the same thing. The epistles of John express it also. The forerunners of the great antichrist had already come. James recommends patience unto the coming of the Lord, which he declares to be near. And Jude proves from the existence of mockers, that it is the last time. The description of Christ's advent thus expected by the New Testament

writers is developed in the 24th chapter of the first gospel; where the ideas of retribution appear in a solemn judicial process preceded by great distress; and the Messiah reveals himself in splendour, ushering in a new dispensation in which the faithful should be recompensed for present sufferings. These ideas are common to it and the Apocalypse. The main difference between the Revelation and other apostolic writings relating to the expected advent, consists in the wide interval which John puts between the manifestation of Messiah and the end of the world—the space of a thousand years; while they place the time of the Messianic kingdom very near the process of judgment.

In like manner the *christology* of the Apocalypse contains genuine apostolic elements. The idea of Jesus the Messiah is, that he existed before the world; that he is the highest spirit; that by virtue of his Messianic nature he was like to Jehovah from the beginning; that he is the Alpha and Omega; yet that he is a created spirit, having received his Messiah-nature from the Father. Hence he is termed 'the beginning of the creation of God' (iii. 14); and the expression 'Son of God' (ii. 18) refers merely to the divine sovereignty bestowed upon him by the Father, according to Psalm ii. 8. Divine qualities and powers are assigned to Jesus, as far as the Messiah appeared in him. Accordingly, he sits upon the same throne with his Father; and the Jehovah-name is his *new* name. The spiritual and potential perfections he possesses were bestowed upon him as a reward for his faithful and victorious career. He is the organ of communication between God and his people; and therefore he is the 'Word of God,' not 'God the Word,' as in John i. 1. When he has accomplished the purposes for which the government of the world was given into his hands, he will resign the power and kingdom to the Father and reign under Him (xi. 15–17). This agrees with the Pauline christology in

the main; though it is here unfolded in a more Jewish form.

The conception of *antichrist* in the Revelation also shows the apostolic times. The name of this power, which became stereotyped as it were from the beginning of the second century, does not appear in the book. But the idea is found in its concrete form, though the appellation is absent. The antichrist of the Revelation is a worldly prince, in whom the powers of evil are concentrated. Bearing the symbolical name of the Beast, he is conceived of as a definite historical person; and other hostile beast-forms are latent in him. He is the representation of heathen opposition to the kingdom of Messiah, symbolised by Nero. Thus the antichristian idea had attained its second stage of development. In the Thessalonian epistles it does not appear in the same advanced stage, but between it and the first form presented in Matt. xxiv. Although, however, the antichristian power is transferred from Judaism to heathenism in the Apocalypse, which it is not in the epistle to the Thessalonians, both stages of the conception fall within the apostolic time. Antichrist has a concrete form, and receives general appellations such as *the man of sin*, *the son of perdition*. It is in John's epistles that we first meet with the name *antichrist*, and the development of the idea to its third stage. There, a plurality of antichrists spring from the bosom of the Christian Church. When the proper humanity of Christ was denied, the hostile element was found in the many antichrists who left the catholic Church, representatives of the world's enmity to the Son of God.

Need we add, that the *pneumatology* of the Revelation agrees with that of the apostolic writings, containing no later ideas than the Pauline? The power of the devil in relation to the kingdom of Christ is presented under the same aspect in the Apocalypse as in Paul's epistles.

Though the arch-enemy of man was vanquished by Christ at his first advent, he was not subdued for ever, but is still active; the contest with him continuing till the second advent. This prince of darkness has legions of spirits associated with himself; and the Messiah by whom he is subdued must therefore be *king of kings* and *Lord of lords*, or as it is expressed by Paul, *the head of all principality and power*.

As far as the individuality of John is reflected in the New Testament and tradition, it is in harmony with the contents of the Apocalypse. The sons of Zebedee were impetuous spirits, whose feelings easily led them into excess or revenge. They wished to call down fire from heaven to consume the inhabitants of a Samaritan village; and begged the foremost places in the kingdom of heaven. John forbad one who presumed to cast out devils in the name of Jesus. He was a Boanerges or son of thunder, with a decided individuality, and an ardent disposition needing checks. As far as he appears in the Acts and Pauline epistles, he is somewhat narrow and Judaic, unemancipated from national prejudices. The Quartodecimans appealed to his Jewish practice about the passover; while Polycrates of Ephesus, states that he was a priest, and wore the sacerdotal plate.[1] This agrees with the priestly character of the seven epistles; and if he were of a priestly family, which is not improbable, he might appropriate the insignia of sacerdotal dignity, representing himself as one initiated into the mysteries of Jesus. Tradition in Asia Minor considered him as a mediator between Christ and the Church. He had the surname of *the virgin* (compare xiv. 4), and appeared as an ascetic who received divine communications. Continuing for a while in Jerusalem, we are unable to tell what subject chiefly occupied his mind. Perhaps he was tracing out the signs of the

[1] ὃς ἐγενήθη ἱερεὺς τὸ πέταλον πεφορεκώς.—Ap. *Euseb. H. E.* iii. 31.

returning Messiah, and looking for the great future at hand. But the dissolution of the bond existing there between the Jews and Jewish-christians, must have caused him to feel that the place was no longer fit for his presence. He could have no further communion with the enemies of Christ, as the unbelieving Jews were considered. The very metropolis they prided in, with all its ancestral renown, was to be overthrown; and a *new kingdom of Israel* brought down to earth. Hence it was time to depart.

After removing to Asia Minor, he is described as indignantly contending against false teachers, both Jewish and Gentile. Irenaeus states from Polycarp, that the apostle, going into a bath on one occasion, discovered Cerinthus there, and, leaping out of it, hasted away, saying he was afraid of the building falling upon him and crushing him with the heretic. Very faithfully are these traits reflected in the book before us, whose tone betrays an impassioned spirit full of rage against the despisers of God and his anointed One, with images of dragons, murder, blood and fire, vials of wrath. The souls of the martyrs invoke vengeance on their persecutors, and all heaven is summoned to rejoice over the downfall of Babylon the great.

In representing the apostle as retaining some of his old Judaic prepossessions, as one whose Christianity was narrowed by the national type of thought, we are justified by the Apocalypse itself, where the *elders*, whose number is that of the twelve tribes, appear a selected body representing the faithful Church of God on earth, and sit upon thrones immediately surrounding Jehovah's, assessors participating in judicial functions. They are the elect, the first-fruits to God and the Lamb (vii. 4, 5; xii. 1; xxi. 12). On the other hand, the saved heathen, though a great multitude, are farther from the Almighty's throne, behind and distinguished from the former (vii. 13). The latter are the crowd, an appendix as it were

to the chosen representatives of the faithful people. A complete equality, therefore, is not assigned to Jews and Gentiles. Though both are admitted into the Messianic kingdom and new Jerusalem, the latter are always put in the second rank. It is true that the 144,000 presented to view in vii. 1–9; xiv. 1–5; xv. 2–4 may be regarded as the whole multitude of Christians collected out of nations and peoples; yet even there the universalism of the apocalyptist has a Judaising aspect, since the entire number of believers is classified according to the old division of the twelve tribes, and every Christian is put into one tribe or other. The title to the kingdom of God is bound up with such classification. The heathen are enrolled among the twelve tribes when they become Christian. Thus their formulising proves the apostle's Judaising view. Yet it must not be thought that the apostle was a narrow-minded Jew of the kind depicted by Schwegler. He was emphatically a Christian. As primitive Christianity was developed out of Judaism, its victory assumes in the Apocalypse the outward form of a kingdom co-extensive with the world itself; with Christ reigning in the royal city of Jerusalem purified and transformed; no longer the old apostate Jerusalem which crucified the Lord and is called Sodom and Egypt on that account. While we see the partiality with which the Jews in particular are called and converted, and the Judaism of the twelve tribes reappearing in the new Jerusalem in elevated splendour and glory, the apocalyptist regards *Christians* as the only orthodox Jews, having the commandments of God and the testimony of Jesus. They are an elect Jewish church, admitting the heathen to their communion. The nationality of John had assumed a Christian type. He had fairly abandoned empirical Judaism by teaching that the Judaism which embraced Christ was *the only genuine* one. This accounts for the fact that he describes Christ's cause triumphing over

Judaism; and exalts the person of the Redeemer whom the Jews crucified.

Two passages are quoted as unfavourable to apostolic authorship, viz. xviii. 20 and xxi. 14. In the former, the writer speaks of the saints, apostles, and prophets rejoicing over the fall of Babylon; in the latter, of the names of the twelve apostles being inscribed on the foundations of the walls of new Jerusalem. It is argued that the apostle would not speak so. The right reading of the former place, 'ye saints, apostles, and prophets,' dissipates the argument founded upon it; since the apostle does not speak of '*the holy* apostles.' As to the latter, the language is not very different from that in 1 Cor. iii. 10, where Paul speaks of himself as a wise master-builder laying the foundation of the church at Corinth. Why then should not John speak of himself as one of the foundations? Is it inconsistent with modesty? If so, did not Zebedee's sons covet the two highest places in Christ's kingdom? We need not be surprised at the number twelve, rather than thirteen including Paul. The types and symbols of the book exclude the idea of minute exactness. Twelve is a number often used by the writer; the twelve tribes of Israel; twelve thousand sealed ones, &c.; and Matthew himself, in speaking of the thrones allotted to the apostles, reckons them twelve, without relation to Paul. A comparison of Paul's own language in the epistles to the Corinthians and Galatians shows that he never lost the feeling of conscious dignity implied in the apostolic office, though he retained his Christian humility. And surely the consciousness of a like dignity was not less among the Palestinian apostles, as we may infer from 2 Cor. xi. 5; xii., &c. Thus nothing in either passage is fitted to shake our belief in the apostolicity of the work.

So far we have endeavoured to keep the evidence for apostolic authorship distinct from the fourth gospel,

in order to simplify the discussion. But when one is treated of, the other must be regarded. Both books have been long current in the Church under the name of John; and a partial comparison at least is necessary to a complete knowledge of either. Their authorship cannot be properly investigated without such mutual references as will place both general characteristics and individual points in a better light. It will not satisfy the demands of criticism to assume the non-authenticity of the gospel from the authenticity of the Apocalypse, or the contrary, because respectable scholars still maintain identity of authorship. Having shown, as clearly as the nature of the question allows, that the one was composed by the son of Zebedee, it remains for the critic to bring into view resemblances and discrepancies as proofs of identity or diversity of origin.

The *christology* of the Apocalypse is apparently in unison with that of the gospel. As the latter describes Jesus to be the incarnate wisdom of God, the former uses language of similar import (iii. 14, 20). His pre-existence is asserted in the gospel as it is in Apoc. iii. 14. The appellation *Word*, distinctive of person, occurs only in the gospel, first epistle, and Apocalypse. And as the evangelist calls the Word, God, so Jesus bears the name Jehovah in the book of Revelation.

Christ, or God, is often termed *the true*; so in the gospel, Christ is called *the true light*; and God is *the true God* in the first epistle.

In Apoc. ii. 17, Jesus promises believers *the hidden manna*; in the gospel, *the true bread from heaven* (vi. 32).

Christ is often styled in our book, *a lamb*; an epithet nowhere else applied to him, except in the fourth gospel.

In the Apocalypse, it is said of the Jews who reject Jesus, that they are not *true Jews* (iii. 9); so in the fourth gospel (viii. 39, 40).

In ii. 11 a promise is made to *him that overcometh*, that he shall not be hurt by the second death; in the fourth gospel, it is said of *him that keeps Jesus's word*, that he shall never see death (viii. 51).

In xiv. 15 a call is addressed to the angel to thrust in his sickle and reap, because reaping-time is come, and the harvest of the earth is ripe. So in the gospel, Jesus says to his disciples, 'Look on the fields; for they are white already to harvest,' iv. 35.

The favourite expression *to testify*, and *testimony*[1] of the gospel, in the sense of declaration respecting the Saviour, public profession and declaration of belief in him, is common in the Apocalypse. Compare gospel i. 7, 19; iii. 11, 32, 33; v. 31–36; viii. 13, 14; xviii. 37; xxi. 24. Epistle v. 9 thrice, 10, 11. Rev. i. 2, 9; vi. 9; xii. 11, 17; xix. 10; xx. 4; xxii. 18, 20.

The use of *to conquer*[2] in the sense of overcoming the evil, opposition, and enmity of the world, with the implication of remaining faithful and active in the Christian cause, is peculiar to John and the Apocalypse. Gospel xvi. 33. Epistle ii. 13, 14; iv. 4; v. 4, 5. Apoc. ii. 7, 11, 17, 26; iii. 5, 12, 21; xii. 11; xiii. 7; xxi. 7.

Countenance[3] in the sense of human visage, is only found in gospel xi. 44, and Rev. i. 16.

To keep the word,[4] is frequent in John's gospel and epistle; the same often occurs in the Apocalypse.

To tabernacle[5] is used in gospel i. 14, and Apoc. vii. 15; xii. 12; xiii. 6; xxi. 3.

To slay,[6] is employed in epistle iii. 12, twice; also in Rev. v. 6; vi. 4, 9, 12; xiii. 3, 8; xviii. 24. It is found nowhere else.

To have part,[7] is used in gospel xiii. 8; and Apoc. xx. 6.

To walk with one.[8] Gospel vi. 66; Apoc. iii. 4.

[1] μαρτυρέω and μαρτυρία.
[2] νικᾶν.
[3] ὄψις.
[4] τηρεῖν τὸν λόγον.
[5] σκηνοῦν.
[6] σφάττειν.
[7] ἔχειν μέρος.
[8] περιπατεῖν μετά τινος.

Hereafter.[1] Gospel i. 52; xiii. 19; xiv. 7; Rev. xiv. 13. Elsewhere, only in Matthew.

To labour,[2] in the sense of fatigue. Rev. ii. 3; gospel iv. 6.

To speak with one.[3] Gospel iv. 27; ix. 37; xiv. 30; Rev. i. 12; iv. 1; x. 8; xvii. 1; xxi. 9, 15. Not elsewhere, except once in Mark vi. 50.

Heaven,[4] in the gospel and epistle has almost always the article; less frequently elsewhere. The like remark may be made as to *Christ.*[5]

Lord, thou knowest.[6] Gospel xxi. 15–17 thrice; Rev. vii. 14.

He answered, saying.[7] Gospel i. 26; x. 33; Rev. vii. 13.

The freqūent use of *light, to enlighten, glory, to appear,*[8] and the like, in a tropical sense, in the gospel, epistle, and Apocalypse, shows a similarity of colouring in the style.

The comparison of Christ with the bridegroom in gospel iii. 29, should be placed by the side of Rev. xix. 7; xxi. 2; xxii. 17, chiefly on account of the diction. So of the water of life. Rev. xxi. 6; xxii. 17; and gospel iv. 10; vii. 37. So of hungering and thirsting. Rev. vii. 16; gospel vi. 35. The image of *cup* for suffering, trial gospel (xviii. 11) is very common in the Apocalypse. The image of Christ as a shepherd (gospel x. 1) is presented in Rev. vii. 17.

After these things,[9] for the most part as a mere formula of transition, is a striking feature of resemblance between the Apocalypse and gospel, as gospel iii. 22; v. 1, 14; vi. 1; vii. 1; xiii. 7; xix. 38; xxi. 1. Apoc. i. 19; iv. 1; vii. 1, 9; ix. 12; xv. 5; xviii. 1; xix. 1;

[1] ἀπαρτί.
[2] κοπιάω.
[3] λαλεῖν μετά τινος.
[4] οὐρανός.
[5] ὁ Χριστός.
[6] κύριε, σὺ οἶδας.
[7] ἀπεκρίθη λέγων.
[8] φῶς, φωτίζω, δόξα, φαίνω.
[9] μετὰ ταῦτα.

xx. 3. Luke occasionally employs the same formula, but not with the same frequency.

The Apocalypse frequently employs Hebrew words, and then adds a Greek explanation of them; which John also does in his gospel, as Rev. iii. 14; ix. 11; xii. 9; xx. 2; xxii. 20; gospel i. 39, 42, 43; ix. 7; xix. 13, 17. This is occasionally, but not so frequently done elsewhere.

To write, followed by the preposition *to*[1] before the noun, signifying the object on which the writing is made, is peculiar to the apocalypse and gospel. Apoc. i. 11; gospel viii. 6, 8.

The doctrine of perseverance is common to both writings, and is expressed in the same manner. Compare Rev. iii. 12; epistle ii. 19; gospel vi. 37.

The use of *to signify*[2] deserves notice. Gospel xii. 33; xviii. 32; xxi. 19; Apoc. i. 1.

The neuter gender is used to denote rational beings, in gospel vi. 37, 39; xvii. 2, 10. So *creature*,[3] in Rev. v. 13; *every*,[4] xxi. 27.

John alone has given an account of piercing Jesus's side with a spear. To this he applies the prediction in Zech. xii. 10. Apoc. i. 7 exhibits the same version as in the gospel. And as the version is a new translation, not that of the Seventy, the same hand appears in both passages.

In Apoc. vii. 15, he that sits upon the throne is said *to dwell* among the saints; an idea similar to that in the gospel xiv. 23, where the Father and Son are said *to take up their abode* with the believer. The same thought is in Apoc. iii. 20; xxi. 22; xxii. 5.

The manner of writing in the Apocalypse, often reminds one of that in the fourth gospel and first epistle, where the same idea is expressed, both positively

[1] γράφειν followed by εἰς.
[2] σημαίνω.
[3] κτίσμα.
[4] πᾶν.

and negatively; and a certain parallelism of thought and expression may be noticed.

More specimens of resemblance have been collected by Donker-Curtius,[1] Dannemann,[2] Kolthoff,[3] and Stuart[4] to prove identity of authorship. But the most striking and plausible ones have been given. The reader must judge of their validity, and draw his own conclusion. Some are far-fetched. Stuart's list needs sifting, because he does not scruple to use the 21st chapter of the fourth gospel throughout, as if it were a genuine part of the work, though Lücke and others ably dispute that position on critical grounds. It is easy to see the weakness of Stuart's reasoning when he asserts that John is familiar with the neuter noun *lamb*;[5] whereas it occurs but once in the gospel, and that in the 21st chapter. And it is surely a proof of haste to adduce the spurious 1 John v. 7, as an instance of the application of *Word* to Christ. In short, his examples sometimes fail to support his assertions; as under the head of Christ's *omniscience*, where some irrelevant places are quoted from the gospel and Apocalypse. But after every reasonable deduction, enough remains to prove that the correspondences are not accidental, and either betray the same author, or show that the writer of the one book was influenced by the ideas and language of the other. These cognate phenomena have not been allowed their full force by Lücke, Ewald, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. On which side originality lies, appears from the internal relation of the two books to one another more than their external form. The Apocalypse betrays a tendency akin to what is known as Christianity in its first stage, or

[1] De Apocalypsi ab indole, doctrina et scribendi genere Johannis apostoli non abhorrente, 1799.

[2] Wer ist der Verfasser der Offenbarung Johannis? 1841.

[3] Apocalypsis Joanni apostolo vindicata, 1834.

[4] A Commentary on the Apocalypse, 2 vols. 1845, vol. i.

[5] ἀρνίον.

Ebionitism; a higher degree of religious progression belongs to the gospel. The development of the religious conception commonly begins with the sensuous and concrete, which it seeks to spiritualise and make abstract. It needs no argument to prove, that the ideas and expressions common to the two works have a more spiritual bearing in the gospel. The evangelist purposely adopts the forms of the apocalyptist, even after their original signification had been laid aside. Perhaps he wished his work to pass for that of the apostle.

The most marked coincidence is apparently in the christology. Here three particulars bear considerable resemblance to the fourth gospel, viz. Christ's designation as *the beginning of the creation of God*;[1] the attribution to him of the name and predicates of Jehovah; and the appellation, *Word of God*.[2] The first denotes his pre-existence. As it has parallels in the Pauline epistles, we think it hazardous, with Zeller to regard the phrase as a mere honorary title, rather than a doctrinal predicate to be taken literally. Though it be obscure, it is most natural to take it in the sense of *the first created being*, or the highest creature. But the fourth gospel makes the Logos or Word to have *formed all things*. Again, Jesus or the Messiah is expressly termed the Alpha and Omega, which is a periphrasis for Jehovah; and the new name, which none knows but himself, is the unutterable name, the *Shem Hamphorash*. Yet the name does not imply that the *nature* of Jehovah belongs to Messiah. It is an old rabbinic tradition,[3] that the appellation Jehovah belongs to three things, the Messiah, the righteous, and Jerusalem; which is proved by Jerem. xxiii. 6; Isai. xliii. 7; Ezek. xlviii. 35. It is highly probable that the apocalyptist alludes to this tradition, because the faithful are represented as

[1] ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ.
[2] ὁ λόγος τοῦ Θεοῦ.
[3] See Eisenmenger's Entdecktes Judenthum, vol. i. p. 449.

having the name of God, and that of the new Jerusalem, and the new name of Messiah written on their foreheads, which name is Jehovah. Besides, the angel *Metatron*[1] in Jewish doctrine is also called Jehovah; showing that the title is given to creatures.

The Messiah is called *the Word of God* in the Apocalypse (xix. 13); in the gospel he is *the Word* absolutely. The two phrases show a different theological stand-point, the former savouring of Palestinian, the latter of Alexandrian metaphysics. The one is the well-known *Memra of Jehovah*[2] so frequent in the Targums; the other resembles Philo's idea.

It should also be noticed, that while the heavenly name of Messiah is called a *new name* in the Apocalypse, the gospel contains the words of Jesus to the Father, 'Thou lovedst me before the foundation of the world' (xvii. 24).

Similarity of expression has led some critics to assume greater agreement between the descriptions of Christ in the gospel and Apocalypse than really exists. The heavenly nature and pre-existence of Messiah was a later Jewish doctrine, which was gradually taken into the circle of Christian ideas and developed there. It has reached a higher stage of unfolding in the gospel than in the Revelation. The most striking mutual term is that rendered *pierce*,[3] the new representative of a Hebrew verb[4] in Zech. xii. 10, applied in both to the piercing of the Saviour, and different from the Septuagint word. It is precarious to found identity of authorship on the use of a mere term; yet its connection is peculiar. We might conjecture, with Ewald, that the Septuagint had it at first in its text; but the assumption is too hazardous. Nor does it remove the difficulty felt by those who argue against identity of authorship, to say that Aquila, Symmachus, and Theo-

[1] Gfrörer's Das Jahrhundert des Heils, vol. i. pp. 318, 319.
[2] מֵימְרָא דַיְיָ [3] ἐκκεντέω. [4] דָּקַר

dotion translate the Hebrew verb by this very apocalyptic word; or that the evangelist refers to the piercing of Christ's side with a spear, whereas the apocalyptist alludes to his slaying generally—the extreme manifestation of hostile belief.[1]

On the other hand, the characteristic method in which the writer of the Apocalypse views beings, scenes, and objects, betrays a different person from the evangelist. His intuitional nature is of another cast. The views of the one are sensuous; of the other spiritual and mystic. In the apocalyptist, fancy is creative and lively; in the evangelist, calmness prevails. The objective predominates in the one; speculation, depth, gracious trust, a loving freedom of spirit, in the other. The one is introspective, looking at spiritual relations with a fine psychological organisation; the other is of rougher mould, viewing things in concrete, plastic forms. Quiet contemplation has full scope in the evangelist; mildness and love find utterance in affectionate discourse. But the spirit of the apocalyptist is stern and vengeful, issuing cutting reproofs, calls to repentance, commands, and threatening; though the promises are rich and bear a pregnant form suited to the majesty of the book. According to the writer of the fourth gospel, happiness arises from faith in the Saviour on earth, and therefore blessedness is a present possession; according to the apocalyptist, the righteous pray for vengeance, and are restored to life in the first resurrection, that they may reign with Christ a thousand years. The gospel presents an idealising, universalist tendency, which breaks away from the Judaic basis and sets the Redeemer's person, grace, and truth, over against Moses, proclaiming the former as the life and light of the world. In the Apocalypse, Christ is the external conqueror of his enemies, whose power is exhibited more than his grace.

[1] Düsterdieck, Handbuch über die Offenbarung Johannis, p. 110.

His coming to reign outwardly fills the mind of the seer, instead of his spiritual sway in the heart. Besides, a sharp, definite, decisive tone appears in sentences short and unconnected, without internal pliancy. The evangelist's mode of writing has a circumstantiality foreign to the apocalyptist. It is difficult to make this argument palpable, because it rests in part on subjective tact and taste. Its reality can be felt more easily than described. Based on a careful survey of the literature that passes under the name of John, it forces itself on the mind of him who surrenders himself to the natural effect. When he perceives the difference of the spiritual elements in which the evangelist and the apocalyptist move, their characteristic modes of apprehension, and the views they take of religious phenomena, creating different styles and diction, he will infer that the one cannot be identified with the other. Power and majesty, poetic energy and fancy, are hardly consistent with a philosophical idealism permeated, and occasionally concealed, by emotional tenderness. The fervour of the evangelist is not fiery; it is subdued by love. A charm lies in his composition. He has refinement and philosophical culture. A solemn grandeur and sensuous symbolism appear in the Apocalypse. Can any reader doubt that the long series of plagues preceding the coming of the Lord, and introduced by demoniacal beings, such as scorpion-like locusts, or lion-headed horses, with fire, smoke, and brimstone issuing out of their mouths, and strange riders, is an objective and artificial imagery foreign to the evangelist's spiritual idiosyncrasy?

These observations prepare the reader for finding that the *doctrinal* type of the book before us is not exactly the same as that of the fourth gospel. In *eschatology*, it has a first and second resurrection, a thing unknown to the other books of the New Testament. In like manner, the idea of antichrist differs in the Apocalypse and first

epistle of John. The antichrist of the former is a notable instrument of Satan; the antichrist of the latter is a plurality of persons who destroy Christianity from within by corrupting the faith. The antichrist of the apocalyptist is outside Christianity, hating both Jews and Christians.

The doctrine of *redemption*, as far as allusions to it enable us to judge, is more Jewish than in the gospel. It is represented by the strong Jewish figure of *washing in blood*; but other terms, such as, *lamb*, *buy*, *called*, *freely*,[1] resemble Paul. Early Christianity was strongly impregnated with Old Testament ideas of sacrifice and atonement, more sensuous than spiritual; and time was required for leavening it with purer conceptions. The love of God in sending his Son into the world to be the life and light of men, quickening in them that higher principle which sin debases, gradually broke through the grosser ideas of propitiation inherited from their fathers by the Jewish-christians.

Though the apocalyptist wrote in Greek, he followed Hebrew sources, especially the later prophets, Daniel, Ezekiel, Zechariah, perhaps Enoch. So thoroughly Judaic is he, that there are examples of what was afterwards developed in a bad form under the name of Kabbala in Judaism, as in xiii. 18, where the mysterious number of the beast sounds like *Gematria*. The sacred number seven, which enters into the plan of the book, as well as three, savours of Kabbalism. So does the description of the heavenly Jerusalem in the last two chapters.

The view of *angels*, *demons*, *and spirits* is also Jewish, unlike that of the fourth gospel. Seven spirits are said to be before the throne of the Almighty (i. 4), meaning the seven highest spirits; an idea taken from the Zoroastrian religion into the Jewish, as we see from Zecha-

[1] ἀρνίον, ἀγοράζειν, κλητοί, δωρεάν.

riah (iv. 2–10), but modified in the Hebrew conception, so that in our book the seven spirits represent the one Spirit of God. So intimately are these seven associated with the Supreme, that grace and peace are invoked from them. An angel interpreter waits upon John; seven angels sound trumpets, and the same number pour out vials full of the divine wrath; an angel comes down from heaven; an angel stands on the sea; an angel has a book in his hand; an angel takes up a great stone; an angel of the waters appears. Lücke remarks correctly, that the fourth gospel employs angels on moral and spiritual errands only; while the Apocalypse places them over the phenomena of nature. It is inappropriate to quote, as Stuart does, the angel at the pool of Bethesda, in proof of the gospel representing angelic control over the material elements, because the passage is spurious. Hengstenberg, however, adduces the same place, without the least hint of its interpolation. This angelology plays an important part in the Revelation, showing its likeness to the apocalyptic Daniel and Enoch. We admit that the envelope of visions in which the author clothes his Messianic hopes required some spiritual machinery like that of angels; but they are introduced so frequently, and the representations of them are so peculiar, as to show another idiosyncrasy than the evangelist's. The view of demons is also singular. Three unclean spirits issue from the mouths of the three confederate beasts; which are termed the spirits of demons, seducing the kings of the earth by bringing them to join the antichristian leader. In like manner, Satan is conspicuous in the Apocalypse; he is even chained and loosed again; he is the great dragon, the arch-enemy of the faithful, the leader of other spirits; with whom he is cast from heaven to earth, and is said to have accused the brethren before God continually. Some of these ideas resemble Pauline ones, but are unlike anything in the fourth gospel.

The language of the book is very different from that of the fourth gospel. It departs materially from the usual Greek of the New Testament, presenting anomalies, incorrectnesses, peculiar constructions, and awkward dispositions of words, which cannot be paralleled. These originate in Hebraism; the Greek being so moulded by Hebrew as to follow its constructions. How well the fact agrees with John's authorship appears from the Acts, where he is called an 'unlearned and ignorant man' (iv. 13). Though a learned man in relation to the sacred literature of his own nation, his knowledge of the Old Testament and probably of the Septuagint, he was not so otherwise; the epithets, so far as they are correct, referring to his Greek culture and facility in using the new language which had almost supplanted Hebrew and Aramaean. In the employment of Hebraisms he is at home. His rabbinic mode of expression is good though artificial, because his Palestinian education and study of the Old Testament prophecies, qualified him for rabbinical forms.

With respect to *cases*, the unusual license is taken of discontinuing the genitive for a nominative, as in iii. 12; xiv. 12;[1] or the accusative for a nominative, as in xx. 2.[2] In vii. 9 the nominative is discontinued for the accusative.[3]

Greek usage is often violated in *gender* and *number*, as in vi. 9, 10; ix. 13, 14.[4] Neuters plural take plural verbs, xi. 18; xv. 4. The same nouns are both masculine and feminine in iv. 3; x. 1; xiv. 19.[5] In xii. 5 *man child*[6] is an imitation of a Hebrew phrase.

In regard to *verbs*, the apocalyptist uses the future like the Hebrew imperfect, in a frequentative sense, as

[1] *τῆς καινῆς Ἱερουσαλήμ, ἡ καταβαίνουσα, κ.τ.λ.—τῶν ἁγίων οἱ τηροῦντες.*

[2] *τὸν δράκοντα, ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος.*

[3] *ὄχλος . . . ἑστῶτες . . . περιβεβλημένους.*

[4] *τὰς ψυχὰς . . . λέγοντες—φωνὴν . . . λέγοντα.*

[5] *ληνός, ἶρις.*

[6] *υἱὸς ἄρσην* for זָכָר בֵּן.

at iv. 9–11. The participle stands for a finite tense in i. 16; while the present passes into the future in i. 7; or into the past, xii. 2–4. Future and past tenses are strangely mixed in xx. 7–10.

In the syntax of nouns the plural stands regularly for the dual, as in xii. 14.[1]

The genitive is always put after a noun to explain it, in the manner of an adjective; and a number of adjectives are linked together, as at xvi. 19.[2]

Two nouns coupled by a conjunction have each its own suffix, as in vi. 11;[3] ix. 21.

The repetition of a preposition with each connected genitive often occurs, xvi. 13.[4]

The genitive absolute seems wanting, unless there be an example in ix. 9, which is doubtful.

The preposition *in*[5] is almost always prefixed to the dative of the instrument, as in vi. 8.

The usage of the writer in prepositions and conjunctions is altogether Hebraised. Thus we have the nominative after *as*,[6] where another case should have stood, iv. 7.[7] This is from a Hebrew prefix.[8]

The verb *to teach*[9] is followed by a dative case, ii. 14, like the Hebrew;[10] *to avenge*, vi. 10,[11] has a preposition with the genitive equivalent to Hebrew usage;[12] and *to follow with* (vi. 8[13]) is also Hebraic. Greek and Hebrew constructions are strangely intermingled in xvii. 4.[14]

These examples show that the language is so thoroughly Hebraistic as to neglect the usual rules of

[1] *δύο πτέρυγες.*

[2] *τὸ ποτήριον τοῦ οἴνου τοῦ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ.*

[3] *οἱ σύνδουλοι αὐτῶν καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῶν.*

[4] *ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ δράκοντος καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ θηρίου καὶ ἐκ τοῦ στόματος τοῦ ψευδοπροφήτου.*

[5] *ἐν.* [6] *ὡς.* [7] *ἔχων πρόσωπον ὡς ἄνθρωπος.*

[8] בְּ. [9] *διδάσκειν.* [10] לְמֹד לְ. [11] *ἐκδικεῖν, ἐκ.*

[12] מִן בְּקֵם. [13] *ἀκολουθεῖν μετά*, like הָלַךְ אַחַר.

[14] *γέμον βδελυγμάτων καὶ τὰ ἀκάθαρτα.*

Greek. It is grammatically irregular and syntactically harsh. Yet Winer says, 'The solecisms that appear in the Apocalypse give the diction an impress of great harshness; but they are capable of explanation, partly from anacoluthon and the mingling of two constructions, partly in another manner. Such explanation should have been always adopted, instead of ascribing the irregularities to the ignorance of the author, who, in other constructions of a more difficult nature in this very book, shows that he was exceedingly well acquainted with the rules of grammar. For most of these anomalies also examples may be found in Greek writers, with this difference alone, that they do not follow one another so frequently as in the Apocalypse.'[1] This language is apologetic, to the extent of substantial incorrectness. The same scholar attempts elsewhere to justify and parallel what cannot be done in the measure proposed.[2] After all endeavours to find analogies to the linguistic peculiarities and departures from good Greek usage in the book before us, either in the New Testament or classical writers, anomalies of such a nature and in such number present themselves, as separate the author widely from the evangelist. Hebrew-Greek like his stands apart and unique.

The apologies which the writer's curious Greek have cost some critics are exemplified in Professor Stuart, who often misapprehends the true state of the question, or wraps it in a multitude of irrelevant words. Even he however is often foiled, and has to confess the uniqueness of an expression in the work, as in xxii. 2, where no parallel is forthcoming;[3] and in ii. 13, where he would drop a word out of the text.[4] 'Is not the Apocalypse,' asks the same critic, 'the production of an excited state of mind, and of the most vivid feeling?

[1] Grammatik, fünfte Auflage, pp. 273, 274.
[2] Exegetische Studien, i. p. 154, *et seq.*
[3] ἀνὰ εἷς ἕκαστος. [4] ὅς.

Is it not *prophetic poetry*?' Granted, and the answer is still insufficient to explain the phenomena. The same reasoning applied to the Old Testament prophets would justify the expectation of frequent and peculiar Hebrew constructions in them. Do they not write the same kind of Hebrew as the historians and poets? Does any violate Hebrew construction extensively because he was in an excited state of mind? He does not. We must not deprive the apocalyptist of conscious calmness when he wrote. The very fact indeed of his writing in Greek, and following Hebrew so much, is against the peculiarities he exhibits.

The characteristic differences between the apocalyptist and evangelist now stated should be considered in their bearing on authorship. Perhaps some may still think them consistent with identity. But the argument is strong against it. Does not absence of the evangelist's *characteristic* expressions, or of such at least as suit apocalyptic ideas, betray another writer? Does not the new form of the evangelist's terms, and their new applications, show diversity? Thus the apocalyptist uses a noun *lamb*,[1] which never occurs in the gospel, where another appears in the phrase *Lamb of God*.[2] The verb *overcome*[3] is common to the two; but a definite object accompanies it in the gospel, as *the world, the evil one*; while the Revelation uses it absolutely. The gospel has one word for *liar*,[4] the Apocalypse a kindred but not identical one.[5] The latter has the noun Jerusalem[6] singular and indeclinable; the former plural and declined.[7] *Behold* is written differently in the two.[8]

The phraseology of the apocalyptist is characterised by such expressions as, ἡ οἰκουμένη, οἱ κατοικοῦντες ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς—ἡ μαρτυρία Ἰησοῦ, ὁ μάρτυς applied to Christ,

[1] ἀρνίον.
[2] ὁ ἀμνὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ.
[3] νικᾶν.
[4] ψεύστης.
[5] ψεύδης.
[6] Ἱερουσαλήμ.
[7] Ἱεροσόλυμα.
[8] Ἰδού, ἴδε.

ἡ ἀρχὴ τῆς κτίσεως τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὁ πρωτότοκος τῶν νεκρῶν, κρατεῖν τὸ ὄνομα, τὴν διδαχήν, παντοκράτωρ, ὁ ἄρχων τῶν βασιλέων τῆς γῆς, which are foreign to the apostle; whereas the favourite ideas and expressions of the evangelist—ἡ ἀλήθεια, ποιεῖν τὴν ἀλήθειαν, εἶναι ἐκ τῆς ἀληθείας, ζωὴ αἰώνιος, ὁ κόσμος, ὁ πονηρός, ὁ ἄρχων τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἐκ τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι or γεννηθῆναι, τὰ τέκνα τοῦ διαβόλου, σκοτία and φῶς contrasted, περιπατεῖν, θεᾶσθαι and θεωρεῖν, ἐργάζεσθαι, μένειν and μονή, φωνεῖν, ἐκεῖνος, πάλιν, καθώς, δοξάζεσθαι and ὑψοῦσθαι, ταράσσειν, παρρησία, πιστεύειν—do not appear in the Apocalypse, or very seldom.

All the diversities now given, doctrinal, theological, and linguistic, are explained by apologists so as to harmonise with one authorship. Donker-Curtius, Kolthoff, Dannemann, and Stuart try to find either the same or similar expressions in both, overlooking those which are *characteristic*; or discover reasons for the diversities satisfactory to their own minds. These reasons are chiefly three—difference of subject, of age, and of mental state.

The first of these has its weight. The Apocalypse is a prophetic book in the main. It describes the future in poetic colours. Though the epistles to the seven churches are of the same character with John's first epistle, and should be a fair subject of comparison, diversity is more prominent than likeness. A different tone and style appear. The compositions are *characteristically* different.

The argument of age has little force, though Olshausen and Guericke think it important. Written as they believe twenty years before the fourth gospel, the Revelation shows marks of inexperience in composition, of an ardent temperament and youthful fire. It is like the first essay of one expressing his ideas in a language to which he was unaccustomed. But the author must have been about sixty years of age when he wrote, a

time when inexperience and youthful fire are past. Besides, the language of the Apocalypse presents no evidences of the unsettled or bungling attempt of a beginner. It has the marks of a consistent and settled usage—of a definite type hardly consistent with the transformation or development implied in the linguistic phenomena of the gospel.[1] A comparison of the earlier and later epistles of Paul shows that time is insufficient to account for the characteristic differences between the evangelist and apocalyptist. Nothing but the hypothesis of two persons can explain them; and Kolthoff's reference to Paul's earlier and later letters is an analogy beside the mark.

Others find the chief cause of diversity in the phrase *I was in the Spirit* (i. 10). Hengstenberg, for example, supposes that John was in an *ecstatic* state; or at least in a passive condition of mind, the recipient of things communicated. The visions and their colouring were *given*, says Ebrard; whereas in the fourth gospel John's own reflectiveness appears. His mind was active in the one, passive in the other. We object to this assumption, because it deprives the author of consciousness, and is contrary to the analogy of prophecy. The Old Testament seers were never without consciousness, even in their highest moments of inspiration. Their own individuality appears throughout, each retaining his characteristic peculiarities of conception and language. Ezekiel and Zechariah had visions; yet their own reflectiveness is manifest. So with the author of the Revelation, whom we must not convert into an unconscious machine under the control of the Spirit. Had he written down the visions at the time he received them, the idea that he was overpowered by the substance of the communications might appear more plausible; but the fact of their not being written in

[1] See Lücke's Einleitung, p. 664, 2nd ed.

Patmos shows that their present form proceeds from later and calm reflection. How could he fall back into the Aramaean colouring which was natural to him, if his mind had been long divested of it? Would he not have retained his proper manner?

We conclude, that whatever deductions be made on the ground that the work is prophetic poetry not prose; that the author was a younger man when he wrote the Apocalypse; that the character of his inspiration was higher, his object different, and that he should not be restricted to the same circle of ideas and language; enough remains to show another than the evangelist. There are two idiosyncrasies, which minor coincidences do not efface.

The decided weight of external evidence is in favour of the apostolic authorship of Revelation. If therefore the apostle wrote it, he did not write the fourth gospel. Yet some of the ablest scholars of Germany have doubted or denied John's authorship of the book before us. At the time of the Reformation, Erasmus intimated his suspicions, thinking it strange that one writing revelations should repeat his name so carefully, *I John, I John*, as if he were drawing out a bond not a book, which is contrary both to the usage of other apostles, and especially his own; for in the gospel he speaks more modestly, and never gives his name. When Paul is forced to speak of his visions, he explains the thing in the person of another. Erasmus proceeds to say, that in the Greek copies he had seen, the title was of *John the divine*, not *John the evangelist*; and that the language is not a little different from that of the gospel and first epistle.[1]

Luther speaks more decidedly against the apostle's authorship. 'More than one thing presents itself in this book, as a reason why I hold it to be neither apos-

[1] Annotationes in Apocalypsin Joannis, Novum Testamentum, ed. 1, p. 625.

tolic nor prophetic. First, and most of all, that the prophets do not concern themselves with visions, but with prophecy, in clear, plain words, as Peter, Paul, and Christ in the gospel do; for it belongs to the apostolic office, clearly, and without image or vision, to speak about Christ and his work. Moreover, there is no prophet in the Old Testament, not to speak of the New, who is occupied with visions throughout; so that I almost imagine to myself a fourth book of Esdras before me, and certainly can find no reason for believing that it was set forth by the Holy Spirit. Besides, it seems to me far too arrogant in him to enjoin it upon his readers to regard his own as of more importance than any other sacred book, and to threaten that if any one shall take aught away from it, God will take away from him his part in the book of life. Moreover, even were it a blessed thing to believe what is contained in it, no man knows what that is. The book is believed in (and is really just the same to us) as though we had it not; and many nobler books exist for us to believe in. . . . But let every man think of it as his spirit prompts him. My spirit cannot adapt itself to the production; and this is reason enough for me that I should not highly esteem it, that Christ is neither thought nor perceived in it; which is the great business of an apostle.'[1] Though he used milder language afterwards, he never retracted his doubts.

Zwingli would not accept passages in proof from the Apocalypse, 'because it is not a biblical book,' i.e. a canonical one. Oecolampadius and Bucer seem to have had the same opinion. Carlstadt shared their doubts. Michaelis assigned better reasons for the negative view. Many others have followed in the same path, including Lücke, Ewald, Neander, Bleek, De Wette, and Düsterdieck. Ewald and Bleek, the latest who have written

[1] Preface to the Revelation, 1522.

on the subject, deserve respect for their learning and integrity; nor should any critical opinion of theirs be dismissed summarily. De Wette's axiomatic principle is right, that if the apostle wrote the fourth gospel he did not write the Apocalypse. Believing therefore that he was not the author of the former, we hold that he wrote the latter, especially as external evidence supports the same view. The critical sagacity of those who attribute both to John cannot be applauded.

Credner, Bleek, and Ewald assign the book to John the presbyter—a hypothesis contrary to external, and supported by no internal, evidence. According to Papias, John the presbyter was a disciple of the Lord. Had he been a disciple of the apostle, his authorship of the Apocalypse might be more plausible; but the one John was not an immediate disciple of the other. No probability belongs to the hypothesis of Hitzig, that the author is John Mark, from whom the second gospel proceeded.[1] His arguments are based on analogies of language and construction, which weightier phenomena overpower.

TIME AND PLACE.

There is some difficulty in discovering the time and place of writing. The prevailing opinion has been that the book was composed A.D. 95 or 96, at Patmos, under Domitian; or after his death, in Nerva's reign. This accords with the tradition that John was banished to Patmos towards the close of Domitian's reign, where he had the visions described in the book. The fact of his being sent to Patmos is mentioned by Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome. Irenaeus calls the emperor Domitian; Clement and Origen style him the *tyrant* or *king* of the Romans. Epiphanius makes him Claudius; the

[1] Ueber Johannes Marcus und seine Schriften, 1843.

Syriac version of the Apocalypse, Nero; with which Theophylact agrees. Again, the author of the *Synopsis concerning the Life and Death of the Prophets, Apostles, and Disciples of the Lord*, said to be Dorotheus bishop of Tyre, names Trajan. The oldest form of the tradition is in Irenaeus, viz. that the apostle saw and wrote the visions towards the end of Domitian's reign, in Patmos, to which island he had been banished. Later writers made a distinction between the time of banishment and composition, referring the latter to Ephesus, after the emperor's death. The tradition is not consistent with itself, and will not stand criticism. Yet we cannot agree with those who think it originated in the words of i. 9. The basis is probably historical. The apostle was compelled to retire to Patmos for a time. The expressions 'for the word of God,' 'for the testimony of Jesus Christ,' compared with their use in vi. 9; xii. 11; xx. 4, can only imply banishment or persecution, and will not bear a milder sense.

In the absence of external evidence, internal considerations come to our aid. The book itself shows that Jerusalem had not been destroyed; if it had, the catastrophe could scarcely have been unnoticed. An event pregnant with momentous consequences to the cause of truth and the fate of the early Christians, would have been surely mentioned. There are distinct allusions to *impending* judgment. From xi. 1–14, we see that the holy city with the temple was not destroyed; for it is there stated that only a part of the city should perish, while the temple is supposed to be still standing. Had both been destroyed, the fact would have been treated at some length. This is confirmed by xvii. 10: 'And there are seven kings; five are fallen, and one is, and the other is not yet come;' i.e. when the writer lived, five emperors had fallen, the sixth was reigning, and the other had not yet come. The series begins with Augustus, so that Galba is the sixth, 'the king that

is.' The fallen ones are Augustus, Tiberius, Caligula, Claudius, Nero; the seventh coming one means the returning Nero, as appears from xiii. 3, 14. Other critics begin the series with Julius Caesar, and fix upon Nero as the sixth, under whom John wrote. This is the view of Bertholdt and Koehler. Galba is then the seventh, and he reigned but seven months, according to the prophecy. But this reckoning is faulty, since Julius Caesar was not an Augustus; nor was it till the time of Augustus and his successors that the Romans ruled over Jerusalem. Others begin with Augustus, but make the sixth Vespasian; Otho, Galba, and Vitellius being passed over. It is arbitrary to omit these names: The most probable view is, that the book was composed under Galba, after Nero's death; which agrees best with 'the beast that was, and is not, and yet is' (xvii. 8). The phrase *is not*, shows that the person alluded to is no longer living; and cannot be referred to the future on the ground that the prophets employ the present for the future in predicting, though Stuart adopts that expedient. The author is not predicting, but simply explaining who the beast is.

The place where he wrote was Asia Minor, probably Ephesus itself, to which he had returned from Patmos. The visions were received in the barren island, and afterwards committed to writing at Ephesus, as is probable from the past tense of the verb in i. 9. This is favoured, among other circumstances, by the epistles being addressed to the seven churches.

On the basis of Irenaeus's testimony it has been generally believed that the book did not appear till Domitian's reign. The chief arguments adduced against an earlier date, such as the time of Galba or Nero, are the following.

(*a*). Nero's persecution did not extend to the provinces.

Were it necessary to speak fully of the extent of

Nero's persecution, we should refer to Tertullian, who mentions *the laws*[1] of Nero and Domitian against the Christians; an expression, says Milman,[2] too distinct to pass for rhetoric, even in that passionate writer. Orosius expressly testifies to its extension beyond Rome.[3] While the spirit of hostility was active in the metropolis, we may fairly infer that the Christians in the provinces did not escape. What affected the centre with terror, would affect the more distant parts of the empire. If persecution raged in Rome, it must soon have found its way to Asia Minor, as well as the various places where Christianity had been planted; for an emperor's example was infectious. That a martyr called Antipas had suffered at Pergamos even in Nero's reign, need not excite surprise. But it is not necessary to assume that he was slain under that emperor. Individual Christians may have suffered in the provinces even before his day. Heathen persecutions in Asia Minor awakened the hope of Christ's speedy reappearance in the minds of Christians. Heathen magistrates as well as Jews, were ever ready to put forth their enmity, even when imperial edicts forbade injury to the persons of Christians.

(*b*). It is also said, that the Nicolaitans did not form a sect as early as A.D. 68 or 69, whereas they are spoken of as such.

Irenaeus speaks of such a sect in his time, deriving the name from the deacon Nicolas (Acts vi.), and referring the allusion in the Apocalypse to it. The sect mentioned by Clement of Alexandria is probably not the same with that here.[4] Nor is there any proof in the book that the Nicolaitans were a sect. Their teach-

[1] Commentarios.

[2] The History of Christianity, p. 188 *note*, ed. Murdock, New York.

[3] Romae Christianos suppliciis et mortibus affecit, ac per omnes provincias pari persecutione excruciari imperavit.—*Adversus Paganos*, lib. vii. 7.

[4] Neander, Kirchengeschichte, i. 2, p. 775, *et seq.*

ing was practical rather than speculative; a kind of antinomianism encouraging sinfulness of life. The writer finds a certain resemblance between their conduct and the morality of Balaam, which led to heathenism. The Balaamists and Nicolaitans were not *two* heretical *sects*, as some have supposed: the lax morality of the latter resembled that of old Balaam. They were a class of men within the Ephesian church, not a sect. And it is doubtful whether these Nicolaitans were the adherents of Pauline free grace, as the Tübingen critics commonly suppose; or that John wrote with a polemic object against Paul's doctrine. The name is symbolical, formed with reference to the word Balaam.[1]

(*c*). The condition of the seven churches shows that they had been founded a considerable time, and disagrees with an early date of the book. In answer to this argument, it may be stated that the Ephesian church may have soon left its first love. It was planted before A.D. 61; and we know that the ardour of converts is liable to cool in a few years, under trying circumstances. The patience for which they are commended refers, as the context shows, to the temptations from corrupting teachers, and the difficulties attendant on the faithful exercise of discipline in the church. The case of the church at Smyrna was similar.

CLASS OF WRITINGS TO WHICH THE APOCALYPSE BELONGS.

Pareus seems to have been the first who thought the book a prophetic drama; and a similar opinion was afterwards held by Hartwig, who terms it a symbolical dramatic poem. The genius of Eichhorn elaborated this view with much ability. Hence the hypothesis of its being a regular dramatic poem is usually associated

[1] בִּלְעָם from בַּעַל עָם *lord* or *tyrant of the people*; Νικολαΐται from νικᾶν λαόν.

with his name. He makes the following divisions: the title i. 1–3; the prologue i. 4–iv. 22; the drama in three acts preceded by a prelude, iv. 1–xxii. 5. The prelude consists of iv. 1–viii. 5. The first act sets forth, in three scenes, the destruction of Jerusalem, the overcoming of Judaism, and the Church's weak condition after that catastrophe (viii. 6–xii. 17). The second act represents the downfall of heathenism (xii. 18–xx. 10). The third act describes the heavenly Jerusalem descending from heaven (xx. 11–xxii. 5). The epilogue contains a threefold address—that of the angel, of Christ, and of John (xxii. 6–11).[1] This theory needs no confutation at the present day. However ingenious, it is baseless. Stuart calls the poem an *epopee*, a name as objectionable as *drama*.

THE OBJECT FOR WHICH THE APOSTLE WROTE.

The object of the writer was to set forth the immediate coming of the Lord in order to support his fellow-christians under calamities already endured and still impending, to foster hope, and discourage apostasy. The world had shown its opposition to the truth, and would exhibit still greater hostility. Hence believers in Christ were encouraged to look for his speedy reappearance, and to hold fast their profession. By steadfast adherence to the gospel, the redeemed should receive the blessed reward which their Master had to bestow. The circumstances seemed sufficiently alarming. The misery of war, the terrors of frequent executions, the perplexities of political affairs, anxious hopes and fears of the future, had produced great excitement among the Christians, and especially such as had not attained to the spiritual views of Paul, in whose sight Judaism had become a thing of the past. The believers in Palestine

[1] Commentarius in Apocalypsin Joannis, tom. i. p. 19, *et seq.*; and Einleit. in das neue Testament, vol. ii. § 190, p. 369, *et seq.*

and Jewish-christians generally, looked for a great revolution, which, beginning with the purification of Jerusalem and the downfall of Rome, should issue in the return of Christ, the resurrection of the dead, the judgment of the world, and the establishment of a Messianic kingdom. Their hopes were raised to the highest pitch. Christ indeed had come once; but that advent fell short of their desires. The humbleness of his person and claims disappointed many, who sighed for a more glorious manifestation, as they had been taught to believe. The heathen seemed to have concentrated their strength against the followers of the new religion. Calamities already endured looked as though they were the prelude to greater. The atmosphere was lowering. Well might the disciples of Jesus tremble. Some had fallen away, needing repentance and return to their first love. The weak had yielded to temptation. Hence it was necessary to reprove as well as console, to censure as well as to encourage. The *central idea* of the book is the Lord's second coming, constituting its prophetic and hortatory character. Christ will soon appear to destroy his enemies and reward his followers in that new kingdom which he is to establish. The time is at hand, and therefore there is no cause for despair. The period of endurance is short. Nothing was better fitted to make John's readers steadfast in the faith. The great event that formed the consummation of their hopes, the expected redemption to which their weary souls turned for solace, was nigh. The suffering may have sorrowfully thought that they should not be able to stand the shock of their enemies; but the writer points to the triumph of truth and righteousness. Exalted honours, glorious rewards, await the Christian soldier who endures to the end. The patient believer shall receive a crown of victory, the Redeemer's approval, everlasting happiness in Messiah's peaceful kingdom. With him he shall reign

continually. Thus the book arose out of specific circumstances, and was meant to serve a definite object. When the lot of the apostle was cast in troublous times, what better theme could he have to strengthen and comfort his fellow-disciples than their Lord's speedy reappearance?

If the doctrinal idea which pervades the book be, as we have said, the coming of Christ to set up his kingdom, the catastrophe which was to usher in the event must necessarily be introduced. That kingdom is realised in the heavenly Jerusalem, and the conception of it is earthly and heavenly together. The glorified earth is the heaven of the Apocalypse. This view is far inferior to the moral idea of the kingdom of heaven announced by Jesus. The new Jerusalem too is a picture of the old, gorgeously renovated and adorned; showing that the seer could not divest himself of his narrow and sensuous ideas. Heaven, according to him, is not a state beyond the present earthly one, in which complete happiness exists; it is another condition of the earthly. The present and future commingle into a picture where the material ground remains.

But what shall be said of the writer's belief in the immediate reappearance of Christ? Was he mistaken about the nearness of the event? History has shown that he was. 'I believe,' says an able lecturer on the book, 'that the time of which St. John wrote was at hand when he wrote. I as little suppose him to have been mistaken about its nearness, as I suppose him to have been a wilful deceiver.' If this be correct, Christ's coming is taken in an unnatural and allegorical sense, for it is explained away into the events connected with the destruction of Jerusalem, and the subsequent triumph of Christianity; whereas the writer of the Apocalypse merely attached the advent to that catastrophe. He did not suppose, any more than Paul, that the one was identical with the other, or that the coming

of Christ was aught else than literal and physical,—for the purpose of destroying his enemies, and setting up a new kingdom in restored Jerusalem. Far be it from us to entertain the idea that the sacred writer was a wilful deceiver. But it is not inconsistent with his apostleship to believe, that both he and the rest of the early disciples supposed the time of their Lord's return very near. Paul's language in the first epistle to the Corinthians shows that he expected to be then alive. It was not till a considerable time after the apostles, that Christians generally began to interpret the coming of the Lord spiritually; a fact which had an unfavourable influence on their judgment of the Revelation. Millennarians there still were who threw the predicted advent into the future; but the spiritual view prevailed over the carnal. Primitive Christianity was corrected and developed by the consciousness of the Church in which the divine Spirit ever dwells. This development appears in the fourth gospel, whose genius is adverse to a second advent like the apocalyptic.

If such be the practical aim of the seer, we need not look for secular history in the book. The kingdoms and nations of the world are not described in it. The genius of Christ's kingdom differs from that of earthly ones, advancing independently of, and frequently in opposition to them. The work contains neither a syllabus of the world's history, nor of the Roman empire. It is not a history of the Church itself, but relates to a great event which the author thought would soon happen. His horizon was dim and limited. His glances at the immediate past are brief; he does not dwell upon the present; but alludes to the near future where a mighty phenomenon filled the sphere of his vision—the coming of the Lord Jesus. Catastrophes and judgments usher in the mysterious drama—the inauguration of the Redeemer's triumph.

These remarks are fully sustained by the prologue and epilogue. 'Blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy; for the time is at hand.' 'The revelation of Jesus Christ which God gave unto him, to show unto his servants things which must shortly come to pass.' 'He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly. Amen. Even so come, Lord Jesus.'

GENERAL STRUCTURE.

The work is disposed on a symmetrical but artificial plan, a knowledge of which is the safest guide to a right perception of the vision-drapery. *Seven* is the leading number throughout. There are seven spirits before the Father's throne, seven epistles to seven churches, seven stars, seven candlesticks, seven seals, seven eyes, seven horns, seven angels, seven trumpets, seven vials, seven heads on the beast, seven thunders. Subdivisions of this number are three and four. The phases of the future are three,—seals, trumpets, and vials. The first four scenes in each of these are closely connected, being separated from the following by a concluding figure. The seventh trumpet brings the description of three enemies, the dragon, the beast with seven heads and ten horns, and the other beast. The number seven is also subdivided into three and a half; or a time, times, and half a time (xii. 14). Thus some numbers play an important part in the arrangement, and determine the general method. The interpreter must carefully distinguish between the normal and the subordinate. Stuart has made too much of this principle of *numerosity* as he terms it, without discriminating the numbers properly. Instead of making *three* the most conspicuous in the author's plan, he should have made *seven*. *Three* and *four* are less prominent, being parts of seven. Ten and twelve do not belong to the general disposition.

Zullig is right in assigning the cardinal number,[1] and his accuser is wrong.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The apocalyptic picture consists of visions like those of Daniel. The descriptions, colours, symbols, figures, are taken from the Old Testament prophets, especially Zechariah, Ezekiel, and the author of Daniel's book. The second Esdras and the book of Enoch also supplied ideas. John lived in the Old Testament prophecies of a Messianic future. His originality lies in the combination of scattered views, and the artificial construction of his book, where there is a patent unity. He revises the existing apocalyptic elements, expands the great Hebrew theocratic conception, adapting it to the progress of events, and forms all his materials, borrowed or otherwise, into a majestic whole, vitalised by the fiery breath of genius.

The future is represented as being written in a book with seven seals, which Christ alone could open; and the seer is permitted to have a view of its contents. As the seals are successively broken, calamities befall the righteous, putting their fidelity to the test. After the sixth, the believing people are themselves sealed with the name of God, for security against subsequent danger. At the opening of the seventh, seven angels with trumpets appear, announcing one after another various punishments on the evil world. At the sounding of the sixth trumpet the people of God or the elect, are concealed in the sanctuary of Jerusalem, and Israel is purified. The seventh trumpet is followed by a description of the hellish powers that oppose Messiah, with the announcement of their destruction. This is succeeded by the final catastrophe, or the outpouring of

[1] Die Offenbarung Johannis vollständig erklärt, Einleitung, p. 120, *et seq.*

the vials of divine wrath, and the decisive battle. Rome falls by the returning antichristian emperor, who falls in his turn before the Messiah; the devil is chained for a thousand years, at the end of which he is let loose and besieges the holy city, but is cast into the lake of fire and brimstone. Then come the resurrection, the general judgment, and eternal blessedness in the new Jerusalem. Thus the seals, trumpets, and vials, are successive phases in the development of the great drama. Though parallel in some respects, they increase in intensity as they near the final catastrophe.

We need scarcely say that the Messianic hopes of the seer were not fulfilled as his fancy and faith projected them, though he did not utter them as mere poetry without belief in their objective realisation. The Jews in Jerusalēm were not separated and purified, as John anticipated. All were destroyed, with the holy sanctuary and the city itself. Antichrist did not return from the East in the person of Nero, to devour and lay waste. Paganism indeed fell, and Christianity triumphed; but not so soon as represented, nor in that way. The first and second resurrections with their associated events, did not happen. Nor did Christ come personally, destroying opposing powers in order to set up his everlasting kingdom. Yet there is a truth in some of the descriptions. Christ came again by his spirit, and is present with his people. His religion conquered heathenism. Imperial Rome fell. But a reign of blessedness has yet to begin. The non-fulfilment of the seer's hopes arose in part from the fact that they were essentially Jewish-christian. Had they been of the purely evangelical type, they would have presented a different aspect. Without objective sensuousness or close imitations of Daniel's visions, they would have grasped the gospel's living power as Jesus preached it when he was on earth, accompanied with the Spirit's operation on the hearts and lives of men. Above all,

the universal love of God would have animated his soul —that great motive power which is to regenerate mankind. But this implies an ulterior development of Christian truth divested of the husk of Judaism.

The work may be divided into three parts, viz. the introduction consisting of i.–iii.; the body, made up of a series of visions, iv.–xxii. 5; and the epilogue, xxii. 6–21.

1. This portion contains an inscription (i. 1–3) and dedication (i. 4–8), with the direct address, and letters to the seven churches of Asia.

2. The body of the work may be divided into two parts: iv.–ix., and x.–xxii. 5.

3. The epilogue contains four pieces, viz. the conclusion of the visions, xxii. 6–9; the close of the prophecy, xxii. 10–17; the seer's final remarks, xxii. 18–20; and the end of the epistle, xxii. 21.

As the early Christians believed that Christ would speedily come again, and associated with that event the destruction of his enemies, the prophet paints the overthrow of heathenism, which he identifies with the Roman empire. That empire again is symbolised by its head Nero, who had recently fallen by his own hand. The story that Nero was not really dead, but had retired to the Euphrates whence he would return with the Parthians, is here drawn by a Christian imagination. He is antichrist. This interpretation is at least as old as Commodian (A.D. 270). The Roman power is personified and embodied in Nero, who would reappear in the character of antichrist. The great persecutor of the Christians at that particular crisis was readily identified with antichrist, because he elevated himself against Christ, and had struck terror into the pious. Thus the Apocalypse exhibits the triumph of Christianity over paganism, which is tantamount to its *universal* victory. There is a gradual preparation for the catastrophe which ushers in the triumph. Dramatic

scenes precede the consummation; and the reader is led on, step by step, to the final issue.

Chapters iv.–vi. refer to the book having seven seals which none but the Lamb could open. These seals denote the incipient act of judgment. After the seventh seal, the sounding of seven trumpets takes place, heralding the approach of the judgment (vii.–ix.).

The 10th chapter is a formal introduction to the following division or the second part (xii.–xxii.). The sounding of the seventh angel-trumpet is naturally expected, with which the judgment really begins; yet there is another delay instead. The end can only take place on earth. Hence the scene shifts from heaven to earth. A mighty angel descends from heaven, terrifying all with the thunder of his voice (x. 1, &c.). The 11th chapter forms an episode. Before the seventh trumpet, Jerusalem is warned, and exhorted to repent in time. Moses and Elias, significant of the law and prophets, testify in blood as witnesses of the Lamb. The next vision describes the enemy of the Church, or the incipient execution of the judgment (xii. xiii.), which is succeeded by the vision of the seven vials, that is, the wrathful judgment itself (xiv.–xvi.) issuing in the fall of Babylon the metropolis, or the final overthrow of heathenism (xvii.–xix.). The last vision relates to the New Jerusalem, or the consummation of the judgment (xx.–xxii.).

It is worthy of remark, that the first four seals are separated from the last three. Time is gained by the episode of the vision of the souls of Christian martyrs, whose cry for vengeance on their heathen persecutors is not answered immediately. After the sixth seal is opened, it appears that they have not long to wait, since the heathen rulers and magistrates flee from impending retribution. Even then, however, dominion is not given to the saints. The scene shifts, and a new vision is interposed. The people of God are sealed. At the

opening of the seventh seal, the end is still deferred. There is a short period of breathless expectation. The import of the last seal is unfolded by means of the seven trumpets and seven vials, each bringing the final catastrophe nearer and nearer. This repeated postponement of the end serves to keep expectation alive, and shows the deep feeling of the prophet.

A brief survey of some leading features will throw light on the scope and meaning of the book.

1. It is difficult to discover the connection between the 11th and 12th chapters. The 10th forms a transition to the second part of the work, and the 11th intervenes. Hence the little book mentioned in x. 1, is the same as the book in v. 1. It is a *little* book, because its contents are concentrated as it were in a focus. What had hitherto been *idea* and *vision* to the prophet, now becomes historical and actual. The scene shifts from heaven to earth. Hence the seer says in xii. 18 (xiii. 1), 'I stood upon the sand of the sea;'[1] whereas he had been taken up to heaven at the commencement of the first part (iv. 1). The preparations for the impending event take place in heaven. When it is on the eve of accomplishment, earth must be the theatre.

2. The beast with seven heads and ten horns rising up out of the sea symbolises the Roman power. The seven heads are identical with the seven kings or emperors, and the ten horns are the ten proconsuls, imperial vicegerents in the thirty provinces. The head, slain as it were yet having its deadly wound healed, represents Nero. The dragon which gave power to the beast is Satan (xiii. 4). The same beast is depicted in xvii. 3 as scarlet-coloured, full of names of blasphemy. The woman on the beast is the great city Babylon or Rome, the metropolis of spiritual harlotry. The second

[1] ἐστάθην as Tischendorf rightly reads; not ἐστάθη, which Lachmann has.

beast, or the false prophet who helps the first beast, is a personification of heathen prophecy, including magic, auguries, omens, &c., supporting idolatrous paganism concentrated in the Roman power.

3. The number of the beast is said to be the number of a man, 666 (xiii. 18). This is made up of the numeral letters in *Caesar Nero*.[1] A shorter form of *Nero*[2] would make 616, which is a very ancient reading for 666, as we learn from Irenaeus. Objection has been made to this explanation, that the author writes in Greek, not Hebrew; but his style of thought is Hebrew.

4. After the fourth angel sounds his trumpet, a threefold woe is announced in viii. 13. In ix. 12 it is said that the first woe, corresponding to the fifth trumpet sound, is past, and that two more are to come. In xi. 14 the second woe is past, 'and behold the third woe cometh quickly.' Yet the third woe is not mentioned afterwards. When or where did it come? Hengstenberg affirms, that the third woe and seventh trumpet-sound are in xi. 15–19; and explains the point arbitrarily. With Baur,[3] we discover the third woe in xvi. 15, 'Behold, I come as a thief.' The Lord's sudden coming is identical with the third woe.

5. Some have thought that the 11th chapter describes a catastrophe befalling Jerusalem, similar to that which afterwards happened to Rome. In this view, the fall of Judaism and the fall of heathenism are leading phenomena in the book. Accordingly Eichhorn, Heinrichs, and others suppose the general theme to be Christianity triumphing over Judaism and paganism. The assumption is incorrect. What happens to Jerusalem is not a catastrophe or total destruction, but a

[1] ק=100, ס=60, ר=200; נ=50, ר=200, ו=6, ן=50 *i.e.*, קסר נרון, making 666.

[2] נרו instead of נרון.

[3] Theologische Jahrbücher von Baur und Zeller, xi. p. 441, *et seq.*

partial judgment or purifying process. And this is only a subordinate scene in the drama of preparatory phenomena. Jerusalem is not destroyed, but preserved. The theocratic seed is spared. Believing Judaism is still an object of the divine favour. The author, himself a Jew, and having patriotic feelings which Christianity did not quench, supposes that the city and outer court of the temple would be trodden down by the heathen for three years and a half, a number taken from Daniel; but that the holy place of the temple would be spared, with the worshippers in it, during that period. James the Just was there, and other Jewish Christians, praying for the salvation of the nation. This is very different from the fate predicted for Rome, the persecuting and implacable enemy of the Christians, which total destruction awaits. Jerusalem would only suffer in part, and for a season. The holy city would be spared, and the faithful inhabitants protected by Jehovah, while the unbelieving Jews would be destroyed. A comparatively small portion of the city falls (the tenth), and only seven thousand of the inhabitants, the majority being saved by penitence. If the issue did not correspond to the hopes of the prophet, we need not be surprised. Inspiration did not enable the seer to predict definite events, though his sympathies were right and true. The chapter should not be resolved into mere symbol, as it is by Eichhorn and Stuart.

6. The millennium, or thousand years' reign of the saints, has given rise to much discussion. Among the New Testament writers, it is peculiar to the apocalyptist, though many rabbins held it, as Gfrörer has shown.[1] The common view of the early Christians was, that the righteous and wicked would rise, with a very short time intervening, and be judged by the coming Messiah. But John has two resurrections separated by a long

[1] Das Jahrhundert des Heils, ii. p. 198, *et seq.*, 210.

interval. That there would be two was already a Jewish opinion, and is probably contained in the book of Daniel (xii. 2, &c.): their separation by a thousand years is peculiar. The chaining and loosing of Satan during the period and at the end of it respectively, together with the attack of the heathen powers on the followers of the Lamb, are also singular. Such ideas do not agree well with the Saviour's discourse in the 24th chapter of the first gospel; nor are they in perfect harmony with Pauline passages (1 Cor. xv. 23–28; 1 Thess. iv. 15–17; 2 Thess. i. 5–10; ii. 3–12). John's description is ideal. The seer gives expression to hopes and aspirations, painting a subjective state for which no objective correspondence in the future should be looked for. That it is merely ideal, is apparent from certain incongruities, such as the risen saints having their camp beside the earthly Jerusalem, and being attacked by heathen nations; as well as from the existence of heathen enemies, after all the inhabitants of the earth are slain (xix. 21).

Bleek[1] supposes that it was not unknown to the apostle's readers, and arose from combining a passage in Psalm xc. 4, with the account of creation, the latter being taken as a type of the world's destiny. As God created the earth in six days, and rested the seventh, so the world would be brought to completion in six days, i.e. six thousand years, and the seventh day, i.e. the seventh thousand, be a time of Messianic peace. Be this as it may, the thousand years should not be taken for a literal period of so many revolutions of the earth round the sun, but for a long space of time generally.

7. As to the period described in the last two chapters, that of the new heavens and new earth, most interpreters take it to be what is commonly called *heaven*; while some, as Hammond, Hug, and Bush think it

[1] Einleitung in das neue Testament, p. 623.

alludes to an earthly, flourishing state of the Church. The ideas and imagery are taken from Isai. liv. 11, 12; lx. 3, 11; lxv. 17–20; lxvi. 22. The future renovation of the earth was a prevailing notion among the Jews, after their captivity in Babylon. In this case John drew from the Deutero-Isaiah and his own imagination. His ideal hopes are, that heaven and earth should become one in the future kingdom of Messiah. Earth in his description becomes heaven, and heaven descends to earth. The holy Church in her triumphant state is the fulfilment of all that was associated with ancient Jerusalem in the Hebrew heart. She is depicted as God's dwelling-place, the sacred city, New Jerusalem, the chaste spouse of Christ, the Lamb's wife. This is the ultimate aim of all apocalyptic prophecy, the everlasting completion of the mystery of God. The picture, which is mainly ideal, embodies the writer's conceptions respecting the consummation of the Christian Church, or, in other words, the everlasting happiness of the righteous. To attempt to find particulars corresponding to the figures employed would be to convert poetry into prose, the subjective into the objective. The seer's ideas should be left in their indefiniteness, else their beauty vanishes. No mystic meaning lies in the details. Elements expressive of magnificence and splendour are combined, to aid the rhetorical beauty of the composition. A new Jerusalem symbolises a new state of things; all the ideas of earthly greatness and excellence entertained by the Jews being centered in their beloved city.

CANONICITY AND VALUE.

The question of authorship has been usually thought to affect that of canonicity and value. But the book may not have proceeded from an apostle and be equal in worth to any of his productions. It is not of es-

sential moment that the Revelation should be written by the son of Zebedee. Value does not depend on canonicity but contents. Degrees of excellence attach to the canonical writings. We are far from denying that authorship is of consequence: it is not of the highest. He who composed the fourth gospel, and John the apostle, would necessarily write differently, because their mental development was unequal. Inspired by the divine Spirit, their ideas, and the mode of expressing them, might still differ. Apostles themselves were not equally gifted. The Apocalypse is not of the same authority as if it had been written by Paul. The Judaic texture it bears, the story respecting Nero coming back from the East with a Parthian army after he had taken away his own life, and the part which that emperor occupies in the apocalyptic prophecy generally, do not consist with Pauline sentiments. The enquirer feels that the more he examines, the stronger is his belief that the book does not breathe the same spirit as that of the fourth gospel, and does not accord with the Church's destination. The proper evangelical sentiment which we see in Matt. xxiv. 14; Rom. xi. 25 is in the background; and the general tone clashes with Mark xiii. 32. Thus the writer's inspiration was not so high as Paul's. The book occupies a lower standpoint than the Pauline epistles or the fourth gospel. Yet it has exerted a great spiritual influence upon mankind. The effects of a certain moral expression in its symbolical descriptions are decided. A high value belongs to its prophetic utterances in moving and strengthening the soul, in bearing it upward to the throne of God amid suffering, sorrow, and persecution, in attracting its sympathies towards the faithful followers of the Lamb, and in exciting aspirations which can only be realised in the new Jerusalem so gorgeously painted at the close. The general strain is elevating.

Alluring promises console the righteous; awful warnings deter them from unfaithfulness to their vocation; the Almighty's vengeance appals the wicked. The grandeur of the book urges on the spirit in the difficult path of duty, with the hope of a glorious crown, a golden harp, celestial fruits, refreshing waters of the river of life; and of living and reigning with the Lamb in perpetual blessedness. We do not perceive the lower place which the work occupies in the development of Christianity till its various contents are examined.

SCHEMES OF INTERPRETATION.

Schemes of interpretation, *preterist*, *continuous*, and *future*, adopted by different commentators, must be rejected, with the exception of the first. Expositors of the continuous and futurist class fall into the fatal error of converting apocalyptic poetry into historical prose, and of making all symbols significant. Nor are preterists commonly free from blame. In applying their principle of interpretation they are sure to err, if they try to show that all was properly fulfilled in the immediate future; or that the seer was infallibly guided in his prognostications and hopes. The apostle's standpoint should be correctly estimated. His idiosyncrasy must be apprehended. The mode in which the old prophets depicted the future should be known, not as if they were able to predict definite events succeeding one another, but as they dimly saw the things to which their enraptured spirits were carried forward, and painted them in ideal colours. Their own sentiments, hopes, desires, and fears, are elements in the pictures they draw—pictures whose general outline alone should be considered *real* to them—though it may be so to us in a very different sense.

ERRORS INTO WHICH EXPOSITORS HAVE FALLEN.

To enumerate all the mistakes committed by interpreters would be impossible. We can only glance at a few.

1. If the historic basis be abandoned, imagination will have ample range for extravagance. The author did not forego time and place, elements that cannot safely be neglected. Thus, he states that the things must *shortly* come to pass, and that the time is *at hand*. So, likewise, it is said at the close, that the things must be done *shortly*. The Saviour affirms, 'Behold, I come quickly.' These expressions are significant as to the period of the visions. The advent of Christ is announced to take place within a short time. One city is the theatre of sublime and terrible occurrences,—Babylon built on seven hills,—Rome the representative of heathenism or anti-christian idolatry. In this catastrophe the judgment culminates, succeeded by the new Jerusalem. Historic personages of John's time appear. Seven Roman emperors are alluded to; one in particular. Unless, therefore, the expositor adhere to the historic present and immediate future of the seer, he will lose himself in endless conjecture. Jewish ideas of Messiah's advent should be known, not less than Jewish-christian ones. The prophet stood in the historical circumstances of his own time, and described the second advent in a series of dramatic and poetical visions.

2. It is a fundamental mistake to look for a detailed history of the Church, or of leading events in the world's history, that affect Christianity. Some find an epitome of the Church's history even in the epistles to the seven churches. Others find it in the remainder of the book; others, in both together. Hence particular events are assigned to particular periods; persons are specified, peoples characterised, and definite names assigned. In this fashion the vicissitudes through which the Chris-

tian religion has passed in the world are supposed to be sketched. The allegorising process by which the present scheme of interpretation is supported, cannot be repudiated too strongly. Though it has had able advocates, Vitringa, Mede, Faber, Hengstenberg, Ebrard, Auberlen, and Hofmann, it is inconsistent with the scope of the Apocalypse as well as the analogy of prophecy, and leads to arbitrary conjectures.

3. We should not look for a circumstance, event, person, or nation corresponding to the images of the seer. 'All the particular traits in this large work,' says Hug, 'are by no means significant. Many are introduced only to enliven the representation, or are taken from the prophets and sacred books for the purpose of ornament; and no one who has any judgment in such matters, will deny that the work is extraordinarily rich and gorgeous for a production of Western origin.'[1] This plain principle has been systematically violated by nearly all English commentators. Thus one of them, in explaining the language descriptive of the effect of the fifth angel-trumpet (ix. 1, &c.), pronounces the star fallen from heaven to be Mohammed. The secret cave of Hera, near Mecca, is the pit of the abyss whence the pestilential fumes and darkness issued. The key of the abyss was given him in contrast to the key of God in the Koran. The locusts to which the Saracens are compared are peculiarly Arabic, since the very name of the one suggests the other, both being similar in pronunciation and radicals![2] If the absurdity of this method needs exposure, the reader has only to look at the hypothesis respecting the two witnesses in the 11th chapter, which Ebrard, reviving an old view, refers to the *law* and the *gospel*; and another has assumed to be the Son and Spirit of God; whereas the whole description shows them to be Moses and Elias.

[1] Fosdick's translation, p. 668.

[2] אֲרָבָה and עֲרָבִי !

In like manner, the fourth vial being referred to the wars of the French revolution, the words 'power was given him to scorch men with fire' (xvi. 8), allude to Napoleon, who employed artillery to an unprecedented extent, and inflicted fiery suffering both on his own nation and others. The men thus scorched 'blasphemed the name of God who had power over these plagues, and repented not to give him glory' (xvi. 9), meaning that the suffering nations during that fearful period (1789–1809), did not renounce the papal apostasy for a purer faith! Another expositor says, that the woman in the 12th chapter 'represents the covenant of redemption; and the child to be brought forth, the righteousness provided by the covenant; that is, the destined means of counteracting the power of the legal accuser or avenger—the means of delivering the sinner from a yoke even worse than that of Egyptian bondage.'

4. The principle of synchronism has been largely adopted by interpreters since the days of Mede and Vitringa, an explanation and defence of it being in the *clavis apocalyptica* (apocalyptic key) of the former. A scheme so ingenious has been followed by the majority of English expositors. The same events, it is said, are represented by a succession of symbols, the symbols being varied while the things signified are the same. Instead of the book being continuously progressive, it is progressive and retrogressive throughout.

The principle in question is connected with that interpretation which finds an epitome of history in the book, and stands or falls with it. The series of visions is progressive; but, as the events which the seer depicts are nearly the same, the progression is prophetic—ideal not historical. It is rhetorical, not a description of successive events.

5. As to the designations of time, those who take a day for a year have never established the truth of their

opinion. In prophecy, a day means a day as elsewhere, unless the number be indefinite. This has been proved by Maitland and Stuart. Most numbers in the Revelation should not be taken arithmetically, but indefinitely, because they are part of the poetic costume borrowed from the Old Testament.

6. In the thirteenth century, that peculiar exegesis began which refers the book to heretics and sectaries. The Romish church set the example. Innocent III., in rousing up the Crusade, said that the Saracens were the true antichrist, Mohammed the false prophet, and 666 years the duration of his power. As the church of Rome grew more corrupt, its opponents applied the descriptions of the book to it. The pope was identified with antichrist; and Rome papal with the great whore of Babylon.[1] Since the Reformation, Protestants have generally found the papacy and its destruction, in the book. Even Davison does so in his Discourses on Prophecy. We need not say that the allusion is baseless. Protestant anti-papal exegesis has as much foundation as Rome's anti-heretic one. Signor Pastorini applies the sounding of the fifth trumpet (ix. 1–11) to Luther, who renouncing his faith and vows, may be said to have fallen. When he opened the door of hell, there issued forth a thick smoke, or a strong spirit of seduction which had been hatched in hell.[2] There is a Protestant parallel, which applies the beast in chapters xiii., xvii. to the succession of popes.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1862; Düsterdieck, 1865; Volkmar, 1862; Ewald, 1828 (Latin), 1862 (German); Züllig, 1834, 1840; Bleek, 1862; and Stuart, 1845.

[1] See Lücke, Einleitung, pp. 1005, 1006, 2nd ed.

[2] The General History of the Christian Church, chiefly deduced from the Apocalypse of St. John, p. 170, *et seq.* 5th ed. 1812.

THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS.

NOTICES OF EPHESUS AND ITS FIRST CONNECTION WITH THE CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

EPHESUS, one of the most celebrated cities of Ionia in Asia Minor, was situated on the river Cayster, not far from the sea-coast, between Smyrna and Miletus. After falling into the hands of the Romans, it became the metropolis of pro-consular Asia; and was famous as a place of great commerce; still more so as the chief seat of the worship of the goddess Artemis, whose splendid temple stood not far from the harbour Panormus. Having been burnt by Herostratus on the night when Alexander the Great was born (B.C. 355), a new and more magnificent structure was reared, which was reckoned one of the seven wonders of the world. Pliny[1] gives a description of its dimensions.

The apostle Paul visited the place on his second missionary journey, as he returned from Corinth with Aquila and Priscilla. He did not however remain in it, but left Aquila and Priscilla, who instructed Apollos in the true faith (Acts xviii. 19, &c.) On his third journey, he revisited the city and abode there two years and three months, preaching first in the synagogue, and then in the school of Tyrannus. A church was formed, mainly from among those who had received John's baptism. Great success attended his labours at Ephesus; so that the inhabitants became alarmed for the worship of

[1] Hist. Nat. xxxvi. 21; xvi. 79.

Artemis, and stirred up a tumult which could scarcely be quelled (xix. 23–41). At his departure he is supposed to have left Timothy there to withstand false doctrines (1 Tim. i. 3), whom ecclesiastical tradition makes the first bishop of Ephesus. Subsequently, Tychicus is said to have brought a letter to the Ephesians, written in Paul's captivity (Ephes. vi. 21). A well-known tradition states, that the apostle John lived and laboured at Ephesus in his latter days. After returning from exile in Patmos he died there at a great age; and his grave, together with that of the Lord's mother, was pointed out in the time of the Crusades. The place became the seat of a bishop, and two famous synods were held there, A.D. 431, 449.

THE PERSONS TO WHOM THE LETTER WAS ADDRESSED.

Was it written to the Ephesians?

External evidence in favour of the epistle's address to the church at Ephesus is strong. All MSS. and ancient versions have 'in Ephesus' in the first verse, except the Sinaitic and Vatican, the former of which omits it, while the latter has it in the margin from a second hand. MS. 67 omits it by emendation.

The testimony of the fathers also favours the reading in question, but with the following drawbacks.

Basil the Great says: 'And writing to the Ephesians as truly united by knowledge to him who is, he called them in a peculiar sense those who are, saying, "To the saints that are, and the faithful in Christ Jesus." For so those before us have transmitted it, and we have found it in the ancient copies.'[1] The author refers to the reading *in Ephesus*, asserting that the verse in

[1] Ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς Ἐφεσίοις ἐπιστέλλων ὡς γνησίως ἡνωμένοις τῷ ὄντι δι' ἐπιγνώσεως, ὄντας αὐτοὺς ἰδιαζόντως ὠνόμασεν, εἰπών· τοῖς ἁγίοις τοῖς οὖσι καὶ πιστοῖς ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ· οὕτω γὰρ οἱ πρὸ ἡμῶν παραδεδώκασι, καὶ ἡμεῖς ἐν τοῖς παλαιοῖς τῶν ἀντιγράφων εὑρήκαμεν.—*Contra Eunomium.* *Opp.* tom. i. p. 254, ed. Garnier.

which it occurs had been received from his predecessors without the words; and that he had found it so in ancient copies.

Jerome's language implies that *both* readings existed in his day. 'Some are of opinion, from what was said to Moses, "Thou shalt say to the children of Israel *he who is* has sent me" (Exod. iii. 14), that the saints and faithful at Ephesus were also designated by a term denoting essence, so that . . . they are called *those who are* from *him who is*. This is an over-refined speculation. Others suppose that he wrote not *to those who are*, but *to those who are saints and faithful at Ephesus*.'[1] Jerome adopts the received reading, 'in Ephesus;' and censures the forced interpretation based on the want of those words.

Tertullian writes thus: 'I here pass by another epistle which *we* have inscribed to the Ephesians; *heretics* to the Laodiceans.'[2]

Again: 'According to the true testimony of the church, we suppose that epistle to have been sent to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans. But Marcion sometimes inclined to alter the title, as if he had made very diligent inquiry into the matter. Yet the title is of no importance, since the apostle wrote to all when he wrote to some.'[3]

These words show that Tertullian believed the epistle

[1] Quidam, curiosius quam necesse est, putant ex eo quod Mosi dictum sit: Haec dices filiis Israel, *qui est* misit me,—etiam eos qui Ephesi sunt sancti et fideles, essentiae vocabulo nuncupatos ut . . . . . ab eo *qui est*, hi *qui sunt* appellentur. Alii vero simpliciter non ad eos *qui sunt*, sed qui *Ephesi* sancti et fideles *sunt*, scriptum arbitrantur.—*Ad Ephes.* i. 1.

[2] Praetereo hic et de alia epistola quam nos ad Ephesios perscriptam habemus, haeretici vero ad Laodicenos.—*Adv. Marcion.* v. 11.

[3] Ecclesiae quidem veritate epistolam istam ad Ephesios habemus emissam non ad Laodicenos; sed Marcion ei titulum aliquando interpolare gestiit, quasi et in isto diligentissimus explorator. Nihil autem de titulis interest, cum ad omnes apostolus scripserit dum ad quosdam. —*Adv. Marcion.* v. 17.

to be rightly inscribed to the Ephesians; but that Marcion and his followers called it the epistle to the Laodiceans, and wished to alter the title accordingly. The word *titulus* (title), which Tertullian uses, means directly and primarily the running title prefixed, but includes in his view the salutation of the letter itself. Because Marcion wished to falsify the title by reading 'to the Laodiceans,' he also wished to omit 'in Ephesus' from the text of i. 1, putting '*to the Laodiceans*' instead. The one step led to the other, so that *title* comprehends both.

The testimony of Ignatius need not be pressed into the argument for or against the received reading. In the twelfth chapter of his epistle to the Ephesians (shorter recension), Ignatius calls them 'the companions of Paul the blessed, the martyred, in the mysteries of the gospel,' adding, 'who throughout all his epistles makes mention of you in Christ Jesus.'[1] Michaelis rightly translates the words of Ignatius 'in the whole epistle,' i.e. in a particular epistle which the Ephesians had received from Paul, the one now extant. Credner, however, relies as strongly as Michaelis on the same Ignatian epistle (longer recension) to show that the letter was not addressed to the Ephesians alone;[2] improperly so, as Lünemann has proved.[3] The various recensions of the Ignatian epistle in this very passage, render the witness of no weight on either side. The twelfth chapter is wholly wanting in the Syriac copy.

External evidence is adverse to the fact that the words *in Ephesus* were absent from most early copies. It is also opposed to the opinion that *in Laodicea* stood in place of them at first. The question may be facilitated by enquiring if the first verse gives a good

[1] Παύλου συμμύσται τοῦ ἡγιασμένου . . . ὃς ἐν πάσῃ ἐπιστολῇ μνημονεύει ὑμῶν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ.—*Ad Ephes.* c. xii.

[2] Einleitung in das N. T., pp. 395, 396.

[3] De epistolae quam Paulus ad Ephesios dedisse perhibetur authentia, primis lectoribus, argumento summo ac consilio, p. 38.

sense without *in Ephesus*. It is possible that the Greek may mean 'to the saints that are (truly such) and the faithful in Christ Jesus,' but it is improbable, and contrary to Pauline usage. The apostle always puts the place where the saints reside.

Internal evidence in favour of the Ephesians as the persons to whom the apostle wrote is not equally strong. It points the other way, and neutralises the external.

1. In i. 15 we read, 'Wherefore I also, after I heard of your faith in the Lord Jesus, and love unto all the saints.' Such language excludes the idea of personal and familiar intercourse. The writer had *heard* of their faith in the Lord Jesus and love to all the saints. He speaks of the first hearing of their faith not of its continuance and progress, as appears from the subsequent context. The alleged parallel in the fifth verse of Philemon does not neutralise the force of the words as evidence for the writer's unacquaintedness with those addressed; '*hearing* of thy faith and love which thou hast toward the Lord Jesus and toward all saints,' because it is dissimilar. Not to mention the different tenses of the verb in both,[1] the case of one simply converted and sent away by Paul is very different from that of persons converted and personally instructed by the apostle for three years.

2. 'If ye have heard of the dispensation of the grace of God, which is given me to you-ward. How that by revelation he made known to me the mystery; (as I wrote afore in few words; whereby when ye read, ye may understand my knowledge in the mystery of Christ.) (iii. 2, 3.) Here the word *if* is equivalent to 'supposing that,' not to *since* or *forasmuch as*; and the passage plainly shows, that the apostle himself was not the person from whom they heard of the thing. Had he laboured among the Ephesians, they must have known his apostolic calling without needing to be told of it in

[1] ἀκούσας in Ephesians; ἀκούων in Philemon.

a letter. Did they require to 'understand his knowledge in the mystery of Christ,' if he taught them three years?

3. 'If so be that ye have heard him and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus' (iv. 21). This passage is parallel to the preceding, and justifies the same conclusion, viz. that the readers had not been instructed by Paul in person.

4. The epistle contains no salutation to the members of the church at Ephesus, though the apostle must have been intimate with many after his three years' abode among them. The case of the Roman church is not parallel, because the chapter containing the salutations is no genuine part of the epistle; and if it were, it does not follow that if the apostle had many friends in a place he had not seen, he had no friends worthy of salutation in a locality where he had spent three years. It does not remove this difficulty to say, with Lardner, that Tychicus, the bearer of the letter, could tell the church of all things and supply the place of personal salutations from Paul: because such as carried epistles in other instances did not cause written greetings to be dispensed with. We admit that it was not Paul's universal practice to insert salutations at the end of his epistles, as appears from those to the Galatians and Thessalonians; but in the Colossian one there are several. Why not here also? His close connection with the Ephesians for so long a time makes the absence of salutations peculiarly striking, much more so than in the case of the first letter to the Corinthians, written to a church he had founded, but where he had not resided so long. Let it not be said that he was less disposed to select persons for affectionate remembrance in proportion to his intimate knowledge of those to whom he wrote, for that is not the fact; and if it were, it would not accord with human nature. When it is also urged in explanation of the anomaly, that circumstances were greatly

changed since Paul had been at Ephesus; that six years' absence must have lessened the number of his personal friends or removed them altogether; that he avoided all allusion to former painful circumstances at Ephesus; such assumptions are mere shifts to explain a difficulty, and one of them is obviously incorrect, for six years had not elapsed since he was there, and a later generation could not have sprung up. He was last at Ephesus in A.D. 57 or 58; and the epistle, if authentic, must have been written between that date and A.D. 62. The apostle was not forgetful of his friends though absent from them for years; nor would he have thought of omitting to mention any because of their possible removal. Though the epistle has been submitted to the closest scrutiny, little has been found to supply the place of personal allusions. It is doubtful if the thought of evil spirits working in the invisible regions was suggested by the exorcising of evil spirits and the use of magical formularies mentioned in the Acts (xix.). Some coincidences of language between the address to the elders at Miletus and that of the epistle, are so slight as to prove nothing. The strange fact still remains, that in writing to a church with which he was as personally intimate as with any other, Paul makes no reference to particular members, or to special circumstances affecting it.

5. Timothy's name is not associated with Paul's in the salutation at the beginning, though the epistle seems to have been written at the same time as that to the Colossians. Yet Timothy was no stranger to the church at Ephesus. Lardner's opinion that he was not at Rome but Ephesus when the apostle wrote the present letter, is conjectural. Absence from Rome on a temporary mission is easily conjured up for a purpose.

6. According to the Acts of the Apostles, the church at Ephesus consisted of Jews and Gentiles (xix. 8–10, 17); in what proportion it is difficult to say. If the

book contained nothing but authentic history, the Jewish element preponderated in the body (Acts xviii.). Yet the letter is addressed to Gentiles (ii., iii., iv. 17, 22), and bears no trace of Jewish readers; not even in ii. 15. It is a mere assertion that the distinction between Jew and Gentile should pass into the background in the present epistle. Why? Is it because the mysteries of the gospel are prominently adduced? Is it because the universal Church is described in all its characteristics? Neither of these justifies an exclusive reference to Gentiles. Even if the conflict between the two parties had passed away, which it did not in the Pauline time, it is scarcely possible that the Jewish-christians in the Ephesian church would have been unnoticed.

Pressed by the weight of these considerations, which Meyer vainly tries to overcome, many have had recourse to the hypothesis that the letter was a circular one, i.e. that it was intended for various churches in Asia Minor. The modifications of this opinion are numerous, some thinking that an empty space was left to be filled up in the first verse instead of *in Ephesus*, either by the writer himself or Tychicus, as each church received a copy; or by Tychicus alone at his discretion. The hypothesis does not remove the difficulty, and is at best a clumsy expedient of modern origin. In circular epistles like those of Peter and James no blank space was left to be filled; and at the commencement of the Galatian letter, which was designed for the use of several churches, the country is specified. Analogy, therefore, would lead us to expect *in Asia*, after *the saints that are* (i. 1). Besides, why should the writer leave a general address, when he meant special communities? Were they all in the predicament of persons who might or might not have heard of his apostolic calling and knowledge of Christianity? Could he praise the faith and love of the believers in a number of churches? There is little doubt that a defi-

nite circle of readers is implied in i. 15, 16; ii. 11, 19; iii. 1; iv. 20.

Believing that the words *in Ephesus* proceeded from the writer himself, we cannot hold the encyclical character of the letter. Why inscribe it to the Ephesians if it were intended for a wider circle of readers? Is it because the circle consisted of the church at Ephesus as the central one, with smaller bodies in its neighbourhood? As long as Ephesus be retained as the right reading, and the church there be included in the circle of readers, it is impossible to account for the language of various parts, which excludes intimacy between the author and his readers. True it is, that a few years had elapsed since Paul was among them, and that considerable changes must have taken place in that time, both in the number of persons he had known and the extension of the church beyond Ephesus itself. But this is insufficient to account for such expressions as those of i. 15; iii. 2–4; iv. 21. Were his friends all dead? Could he suppose them wholly gone, and imagine a community, most of whom were strangers to him? The extension of the church beyond the limits of the city itself could not induce him to refrain from the specific, and deal with what was general; rather would the specific of the Ephesian church proper exclude the general; though the latter might be more applicable to the added portions of the Christian community or communities. Thus the encyclical nature of the epistle fails to satisfy the required conditions of the case, being out of harmony both with the common and best attested designation of the epistle, as well as with its general contents. The only plausible room for it is in the assumption that the church at Ephesus was not one of the circle intended—an assumption counter to the evidence of the received text in i. 1.

Another hypothesis is, that the epistle was addressed to the Laodiceans, and is mentioned in Coloss. iv. 16.

This, it is alleged, was Marcion's opinion, as we learn from Tertullian. The old Latin version translated the passage in the Colossian letter as speaking of an epistle *to* the Laodiceans; and if Marcion used that version he may have followed it here. The apostle himself did not found the church at Laodicea, and therefore the members of it were strangers to him.

This view cannot stand examination. On the supposition that the apostle addressed a letter to the Colossians and another to the Laodiceans simultaneously by the same messenger, he would not have included the brethren in Laodicea in a salutation inserted in the epistle to the Colossians; neither would he have requested the latter to see that the epistle specially addressed to them should be read in the Laodicean church. There would be no propriety in having an epistle meant for the Colossians read to Laodiceans who had one of their own from the same hand.

The testimony of Marcion that the present letter had the title of *that to the Laodiceans* is worth little. He followed his own judgment more than tradition. He found the title 'to the Ephesians,' and wished to change it. So too he found *in Ephesus* in the first verse, and was desirous to omit it agreeably to the altered inscription; or to put *to the Laodiceans* instead. Probably he inferred that it was addressed to the Laodiceans, from Coloss. iv. 16.

In concluding this topic we cannot but believe that the common reading is authentic, in accordance with overwhelming external evidence; and that the title is consequently correct. The letter was addressed to the Ephesians, not to the Laodiceans. It was not encyclical but specific.

What is to be said of its contents? As they disagree with Pauline authorship, that authorship cannot be maintained. The difficulties inherent in the belief that Paul wrote the letter to the church at Ephesus are

insuperable. The omission of the disputed words *in Ephesus* at an early period arose out of them. Marcion probably felt them; and therefore suggested another title, *to the Laodiceans*. Ussher felt them too, and supposed that the letter was encyclical. Yet these expedients are unsatisfactory, and fail to explain the phenomena.

AUTHENTICITY.

Antiquity is generally agreed in assigning the epistle to Paul. Polycarp alludes to it: 'As it is expressed in these Scriptures: "Be ye angry, and sin not;" and, "Let not the sun go down upon your wrath"'[1] (Ephes. iv. 26).

Here Ephes. iv. 26 is joined to a quotation from the 4th Psalm (verse 4), and the term *Scripture* inexactly applied to both, whereas the author meant it solely for the Old Testament citation, according to the view entertained in his day. Or he may have believed that the phrase belonging to the Ephesian epistle belonged to the Old Testament, not the New. We have indeed only the Latin version, and the Greek may have been different. The translator has introduced a word of Jesus's with 'as it is written,' though it is not found in the Greek text of Matt. v. 3; Luke vi. 20 (c. 2). Hence it is not improbable that he acted similarly here. A passage in the 1st chapter also shows acquaintance with our epistle, for Ephes. ii. 8 was in the writer's mind. The same remark applies to words in the 4th chapter, which show a reminiscence of Ephes. vi. 11.

A passage in Ignatius has been already quoted. In addition to it, the first chapter of his letter to the Ephesians contains an obvious reminiscence of Ephes. v. 2. The sixth chapter of his letter to Polycarp also shows acquaintance with Ephes. vi. 13–17.

[1] Ut his scripturis dictum est: Irascimini et nolite peccare: et, Sol non occidat super iracundiam vestram.—*Ep. ad Philip.* xii.

Tertullian's testimony has also been adduced.

The work was in Marcion's canon, the Muratorian list, the old Latin and Syriac versions.

Irenaeus is the first who expressly names Paul as author: 'Even as the blessed Paul says in his epistle to the Ephesians, that "we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones."'[1] In another place he writes: 'Therefore Paul the apostle said: "one God the Father, who is above all, and through all, and in us all"' (Ephes. iv. 6).[2]

Clement of Alexandria says: 'Wherefore also he writes in the epistle to the Ephesians, "Be ye subject one to another in the fear of God,"' &c.[3] In another work he says: 'Writing to the Ephesians he has most clearly unfolded that which is sought for in this manner: "Till we all come into the unity of faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, unto a perfect man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness,"' &c.[4]

The Valentinians, as we learn from Irenaeus, adduced in their favour such passages as i. 1, 2, 4, 14. Ptolemy quoted Ephes. ii. 15; and Theodotus appealed to iv. 9, 10, 24, 30.[6] Basilides used the epistle as Scripture, for so we learn from Hippolytus.[7]

Succeeding writers acknowledge the epistle as an authentic Pauline production. Thus external evidence is unanimous. The greatest value is attached to the

[1] Καθὼς ὁ μακάριος Παῦλός φησιν, ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους ἐπιστολῇ· ὅτι μέλη ἐσμὲν τοῦ σώματος, ἐκ τοῦ σαρκὸς αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐκ τῶν ὀστέων αὐτοῦ. —*Adv. Haeres.* lib. v. 2, § 3.

[2] Ideo Paulus apostolus dixit: unus Deus Pater, qui super omnes et per omnia et in omnibus nobis.—Lib. ii. 2.

[3] Διὸ καὶ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἐφεσίους γράφει, ὑποτασσόμενοι ἀλλήλοις ἐν φόβῳ Θεοῦ, κ.τ.λ.—*Stromata*, iv. § 65, p. 592, ed. Potter.

[4] σαφέστατα δὲ Ἐφεσίοις γράφων ἀπεκάλυψε τὸ ζητούμενον ὧδέ πως λέγων· Μέχρι καταντήσωμεν οἱ πάντες, κ.τ.λ.—*Paedagog.* i. § 18, p. 108, ed. Potter.

[5] Contra Haeres. lib. i. 8, 9.

[6] Excerpta Theodoti, in Fabricius's Bibliotheca Graeca, vol. v., but excluded from Harles's edition.

[7] Philosophumena, lib. vii. 26, p. 374, ed. Duncker et Schneidewin.

testimonies of Polycarp and Irenaeus, because the former was a disciple of the apostle John who lived at Ephesus; and Irenaeus was Polycarp's disciple. But Polycarp's epistle is not all authentic, so that Irenaeus's evidence has no relation to an apostolic voucher. Still the unanimous tradition of the Church is worth something, though it cannot be traced farther back than A.D. 170. Between Paul's imprisonment and A.D. 170, above a century elapsed; which leaves room for historical criticism to deny the authenticity, if it have sufficient grounds.

A variety of particulars in the epistle raise suspicion against it, and lead to the conclusion that Paul was not the writer.

1. There is a striking resemblance between it and the letter to the Colossians, both in ideas and language. It is true there are also points of difference; but they are less prominent than coincidences. If the reader will peruse the table of parallels given by De Wette,[1] he will see how much agreement exists. And it could not have been accidental. The imitation is too close and continuous for that. Thus i. 3–ii. 10 is partly the Colossian epistle amplified; partly a verbal parallel; ii. 11–22 is tolerably independent, but with occasional resemblances to the prior letter; while iii. 1–9 is a paraphrase of Coloss. i. 24–27; iii. 10–21 and iv. 1–21 are independent. iv. 22–32 is a reproduction of Coloss. iii. 8–13. v. 1–21 is tolerably independent, though not without resemblances to the preceding epistle. v. 22–vi. 9 is from Coloss. iii. 18–iv. 1; vi. 10–20 is original; but vi. 21, 22 agrees with Coloss. iv. 7, 8. vi. 23, 24 is independent. Out of the 155 verses contained in our epistle 78 contain expressions identical with those in the Colossian letter. The usual explanation of this, founded on the fact of their contemporaneous origin,

[1] Einleit. in das N. T., pp. 313-318, ed. 6.

when the same thoughts and frequently the same expressions were fresh in the writer's mind, is inadequate, because the resemblances show inferiority on the part of the copier, who must have been the writer of the epistle to the Ephesians. He is dependent on the other to so great an extent as to put an apostle out of the question. Paul could not have been so poor in ideas and words as to reproduce himself in an inferior degree. The dependence is most apparent in i. 3; ii. 10; in iii. 1–9; and iv. 22–24. Inferiority and partial unsuitability are exemplified in iii. 15, 16 compared with Coloss. ii. 19; i. 17, 18 compared with Coloss. i. 9; ii. 5 compared with Coloss. ii. 13; ii. 15 compared with Coloss. ii. 14; iv. 4 compared with Coloss. iii. 15; v. 15 compared with Coloss. iv. 5; v. 22 compared with Coloss. iii. 18.

2. Unapostolic ideas and phrases occur: such as, 'his holy apostles *and prophets*' (iii. 5); 'he gave some apostles *and some prophets*,' &c. (iv. 11); 'built on the foundation of the apostles *and prophets*' (ii. 20). In these passages *Christian* prophets are meant as distinguished from apostles. But we know from the first epistle to the Corinthians, that the apostle looked upon prophecy as a gift or charism; not as a characteristic of the true Church. Hence the passages quoted betray a post-apostolic age. The epithet *holy*, applied to the apostles in iii. 5, shows a time when they were looked upon with greater reverence than they received during their life; and excludes Paul himself, especially as he is made to say in iii. 8, 'unto me, who am less than the least of all saints.' The two expressions disagree, neither suiting Paul. In 1 Cor. xv. 9, the apostle calls himself 'the least of the apostles,' which phraseology is imitated and exaggerated in Ephes. iii. 8. And how could a writer who says he is *less than the least of all saints* refer the Ephesians to the epistle he had written, that they might see from it what insight he had into

the mystery of Christ (iii. 4)? Surely his pointing them to the letter as an evidence of his profound knowledge, is unsuitable to one fully conscious of apostolic authority.

In ii. 8–10, we read: 'For by grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works, lest any man should boast. For we are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them.' Here the addition, '*not of works*, lest any man should boast, *for we are his workmanship*, created in Christ Jesus unto good works,' &c., is strange and inappropriate. A denial of works in this connection is unsuitable both for Jewish and Gentile Christians. Had the Mosaic law been mentioned, the antithesis of works to faith would have been in its place in relation to Jewish-christians. The Gentiles did not need to be warned against reliance on works.

'Let him that stole steal no more: but rather let him labour, working with his hands the thing which is good,' &c. (iv. 28). This admonition to a church where the apostle had laboured three years is unsuitable, especially the mild form it assumes. The thief is differently spoken of in 1 Cor. v. 11; vi. 9, and severely censured. The same remark applies to the prohibition, 'Be not drunk with wine, wherein is excess' (v. 18). The Christians of Asia Minor had no tendency to drunken excesses, but rather to ascetic abstinence from wine; and the advice given to Timothy might, perhaps, have been more suitable: 'drink a little wine.' In any case, the exhortation is a singular one in the mouth of Paul writing to persons whom he builds up in the glorious doctrines of a catholic church, pure and unspotted.

The writer has peculiar ideas about evil spirits, whom he supposes to live in the air, to be under a head or prince, and to be very numerous. His language intimates that there are different orders or ranks among

them, and that Christians have to resist their evil influence with persevering opposition, because it is most injurious to their spirituality. Such demonological doctrine is unpauline. Whether it be of Jewish or Gentile origin is uncertain. It may have proceeded from both sources. How readily it could be linked on to Paul's ideas, is apparent from the fact of his repeated allusions to Satan's temptations and the necessity of resisting them (ii. 2; vi. 12, 13). Instead of 'neither give place to the devil,' the Pauline expression is 'give place to wrath' (Rom. xii. 19). It is remarkable that there is a similar phrase to that in iv. 27, in the Clementine homilies (xix. 2), where it is adduced as a saying of Christ's, being probably taken from the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

A phrase applied to all men, and peculiar to the writer, is 'by nature the children of wrath' (ii. 3), which is commonly taken for the proof-passage of 'original sin.' But the apostle Paul nowhere expresses the idea that the natural state of mankind—that which belongs to them by birth and development—is one in which they are subject to the wrath of God.

The co-ordination of faith and love is unpauline (vi. 23). Instead of saying 'faith which worketh by love' (Gal. v. 6), the writer has, 'love with faith.' The two are also placed together in the first epistle to Timothy. The closing benediction in which both terms stand, does not savour of Paul, because it is not addressed to the readers directly, and has the difficult expression rendered 'in sincerity,'[1] in the English version. Exegetical difficulties do not belong to authentic Pauline benedictions at the close of letters.

The explanation which is given of Psalm lxviii. 18, in iv. 8, could scarcely have proceeded from the apostle Paul. Were it an allegorical or typical adaptation of

[1] ἐν ἀφθαρσίᾳ.

the Psalm to Christ, it might perhaps be justified; but it is not. The writer understands the passage he quotes to refer to Christ, who after his incarnation and completed work on earth, ascended to heaven, and distributes gifts to men. To bring out that sense there is a perceptible departure from the original, an essential alteration of it. The Hebrew describes Jehovah as a victorious monarch returning from battle and ascending to Zion, receiving gifts along his triumphal march in the men who do him homage. How could an apostle identify Christ with Jehovah, and change the *receiving* into the *giving* of gifts? The shifts of interpretation resorted to, for the purpose of justifying the Pauline nature of the quotation, are well exemplified by Harless.[1] In like manner it is unusual with Paul to speak of 'the God of our Lord Jesus Christ' (i. 17). His phraseology is, 'the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.' God is also called the 'Father of glory' (i. 17) 'who created all things' (iii. 9), 'from whom everything that has a father is named' (iii. 15); which ideas have no analogy elsewhere.

3. The mode of writing and style are perceptibly inferior to Paul's. There is a fulness of expression which partakes of the verbose and redundant. The words are manifold, without conveying proportionate ideas. A poverty of meaning is often observable beneath a superfluity of terms. It is not necessary to read far to perceive verbosity. 'In whom we have boldness and access *with confidence*, by the faith *of him*;' 'that in the ages to come he might show the exceeding riches of his grace, *in his kindness* towards us, by Jesus Christ.' 'Ye may be able to comprehend with all saints what is *the breadth and length* and depth and height; *and to know* the love of God, which passeth knowledge;' 'if so be

[1] Commentar über den Brief Pauli an die Ephesier, p. 350, *et seq.* 1st ed.

that ye *have heard him* and have been taught by him, as the truth is in Jesus,' &c., &c. If we had not the Colossian epistle, the language would appear better and the thoughts more valuable; but the briefer style of the prior letter, with its natural and forcible development of ideas, throws the thoughts and diction of its successor into the shade, especially when so much is borrowed. Besides, the syntax is irregular and intricate; the rhetoric weakly expanded. We admit that the apostle Paul did not write logically; that his constructions are often anomalous, his figures mixed, his sentences awkward or abrupt and his language full of passion; but with all these drawbacks, degeneracy of style and syntax, as well as poverty of ideas, are obvious in the Ephesian epistle. If Paul wrote it, he repeated himself without improvement.

These observations are supported by abundant evidence. Thus we read in iv. 16: 'From whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love,' which is a wordy expansion of Coloss. ii. 19, and inferior to it. A similar remark applies to vi. 18–20: 'Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance, and supplication for all saints; and for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel, for which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak,' which is borrowed from Coloss. iv. 2–4. The comparison of the Christian to a soldier, and the different parts of his armour to various graces or gifts (vi. 11–17), is spun out in rhetorical fashion and bears no Pauline stamp. It appears to be developed out of 2 Cor. x. 3, 4, where the theme is briefly touched without a tasteless or tedious descent

into particulars, which only weakens the general impression.

In iii. 8, 9, we read: 'Unto me, who am less than the least of all saints, is this grace given, that I should preach among the Gentiles the unsearchable riches of Christ; and to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God; who created all things by Jesus Christ.' Here there is a needless repetition of what had been said a few verses before, about the grace of God given to the writer to preach among the Gentiles a mystery which had been hid for ages but was now manifested. It is taken from Coloss. i. 26, 27, in part verbally.

As to syntax and sentences, i. 3–14 may be called one long period, whose parts are loosely joined. So is iii. 14–19. At ii. 1 there is an interruption, and the construction is resumed at the fourth verse. At iii. 2 there is a digression, the thread of discourse not being resumed till the fourteenth verse. In i. 15–ii. 7, which may be termed a continuous sentence, the successive statements are generally appended to one another by the copulative conjunction *and*, which gives a lame effect to the whole. The stream of thought flows on; but is weakened as it proceeds by superfluous expressions and loose junctions. The obscurity in vi. 9, 'do *the same things* unto them,' arises from paraphrasing the word *equality* in Coloss. iv. 1. The union of the two verbs in v. 5 [1] is without example in other books of the New Testament, as is the optative mood after the conjunction *that* (ἵνα) in i. 17; iii. 16. But these grammatical peculiarities are perhaps compatible with Paul's authorship.

Neither the encyclical nature of the epistle nor the supposition of free dictation explains these peculiarities. Let the mode of writing be compared with that of the

[1] ἴστε γινώσκοντες.

epistle to the Romans—the system of inserting periods and interrupting the thread of discourse, with the sharp, marked method of the Roman letter—and the difference becomes palpable.

4. The epistle betrays a want of specific purpose. If it was addressed by Paul to the Ephesian church, why does it deal in generalities, so that the reader can neither discover the occasion that called it forth, nor the peculiar conditions of the persons? It is not polemic but didactic. Apologists find it easy to say that he had no particular doctrine to prove or defend, no error to combat; that he only meant to set forth the glorious constitution and privileges of the universal Church under its head Jesus Christ. This, however, is not his practice. Other letters show a specific object and personal references. Why should the present be unlike them? Does not the absence of definite traits betray another author? The *general* character of the thoughts expressed is an argument against Pauline authorship, unless the apostle had not been among the Ephesians; in which case he would have written to them as strangers. The only personal notice is the mention of Tychicus in vi. 21, taken almost verbally from Coloss. iv. 7, 8.

5. Though the occurrence of words that appear in no other Pauline epistle cannot prove diversity of authorship, for every letter has peculiar expressions of its own, some may be of such a nature as to excite suspicion, and confirm that diversity. Here may be adduced τὰ ἐπουράνια *heaven* (i. 3, 20; ii. 6; iii. 10; vi. 12); τὰ πνευματικὰ *spirits* (vi. 12); κοσμοκράτορες *subordinate spirits* (vi. 12); σωτήριον (vi. 16); πολυποίκιλος σοφία (iii. 10) *manifold wisdom.* *To be filled unto* (iii. 19). *The kingdom of Christ and of God* (v. 5), is not found in Paul's epistles; neither does περιποίησις mean *possession* or *purchased possession* (i. 14), in his writings. οἰκονομία (i. 10; iii. 9), is *the*

divine administration, not as in 1 Cor. ix. 17; Coloss. i. 25, and even in iii. 2, *the dispensation of the apostolic office*; ἀφθαρσία *incorruptness* or *sincerity* (vi. 24), only in Titus ii. 7; whereas Paul uses it in the sense of *immortality* (Rom. ii. 7); αἰὼν (ii. 2), *the course* or *moving principle, the spirit*, different from its use in other places; *the prince of the power of the air* (ii. 2) seems to be identical with Paul's *prince* or *god of this world*. The appellation *devil* occurs twice (iv. 27; vi. 11), which is not found in Paul's authentic epistles. The apostle uses *Satan*.[1] The term *fulness* (iii. 19; iv. 13) has a different use from that in the Colossian epistle; especially in i. 23 where it is applied to the Church.

These considerations taken together, suffice to cast strong doubts on the Pauline authorship of the epistle. The sentiments indeed are generally Pauline because borrowed from the Colossian and other epistles, and the diction is of the same character; but both betray marks of another writer. Amid striking similarities, peculiar phenomena point to an unknown person inferior to the apostle, purposely repeating from his pages what he could not have otherwise written, betraying a wordiness behind which the thoughts lag, and occasionally uttering sentiments which Paul would hardly express. What is the writer's own does not approve itself as excellent; nor can we admire the garb in which it appears. His mental power is not characteristically original, being a reflection of Paul's.

In questions of this nature much depends on critical perception and taste. The standard of judgment must vary with the person who judges. Subjective feelings may indeed be too active, and the perceptive power too subtle. Under such circumstances, 'subjective cavils' may not be inapplicable to the fancies of the critic. But it is impossible to exclude subjectivity. The feel-

[1] De Wette, Einleit. p. 319.

ings must and ought to perform a part. A sense of taste, aided by known phenomena, ideas of the proper and suitable under certain conditions, cannot but affect conclusions. A rough critic who is mainly objective, or at home only in generals, cannot decide questions of thought and language involving fine comparisons. What then? Was the writer a *successful forger?* Did he commit a pious fraud? So they love to speak, who cannot or will not transport themselves into early Christian times. Forgery is a term of modern origin and meaning, wholly inapplicable to the pseudonymous Christian writings which appeared in the first and second centuries. The gifted author of the epistle had no wish to deceive or impose upon others, but wrote in the name of Paul to procure general acceptance for his work. He borrowed the thoughts and words of the master, that he might be able to enlighten his fellow-christians more effectually. His production is both Pauline and unpauline. The fact that he imitated Paul in the Colossians, without using skill to avoid everything that might seem unlike him; that he employed acknowledged Pauline materials, without carefulness to shun whatever was unpauline, puts him out of the class of deceitful forgers. It is not surprising that an uncritical age failed to discern difference of authorship. Indeed the early Christians, even had they perceived the diversity, would not have attached much importance to it, or rejected the epistle on that account. As their spiritual instincts were better than their critical judgment, they rightly gave the letter a place in the canon. Its universal acceptance as Paul's for so long a time is no valid argument against its not being his—certainly no ground for branding it as a *forgery*. The production having a general Pauline cast about it was received as the apostle's, notwithstanding the marks of another authorship which it bears to the critical eye. If it be upheld as an authentic work of Paul's by the

majority of modern scholars, is it surprising that it should have been received as his at first? Christians were then unable or indisposed to examine its claims. Enough that it met their spiritual wants and fostered the divine life within them. Inspiration was not confined to the apostles. Apostolic men had it. The author was not a mere imitator. He is not formal, specific, uniformly and mechanically dependent. He has deviations from Paul—peculiarities evincing some originality. The model is abandoned, if not extensively at least pretty often; so that he had a degree of independence. None can say that the differences are wide, or the inconsistencies between Paul and our writer everywhere abundant. De Wette himself does not detect them at every turn. The general discrepancy arises out of following the Colossian epistle, which is a difference amid likeness—the variation of an imitator not servile, but with ideas and language of his own as occasion arises. The disciple does not equal, though he approaches, the master. With less vigour, he had diffuse breadth; an expansiveness of diction that becomes verbosity when unsupported by wealth of thought.

These observations supply an answer to the statements of Harless, who tries to show that the epistle is *pervaded* by a course of thought of its own, and contains important additions to the parallels of the Colossian letter. The passages respecting the symbolical nature of marriage and the Christian armour are not important, neither do they seem worthy of Paul. And we cannot allow that the *leading* topics of the two works are different, as though the one writer dwelt mainly on the glory of Christ's person, the other on the great *facts* of redemption. On the contrary, a dogmatic idea of the person of Christ pervades both, forming a basis for the unity of the Church. But the Colossian epistle sets forth Christ as the foundation of Christian life; the

Ephesian, as the foundation both of Christian life and the unity of the Church. The differences must not be exaggerated, as they are by Harless and those who agree with him. They are of a minor kind, not characteristic or leading. The redemptive work of Christ appears in both as of wide-reaching influence, the Church being its chief manifestation.

The preceding discussion respecting authorship implies that the Ephesian was later than the Colossian epistle. Those who suppose that Paul wrote both during the same captivity may discuss their relative claims to priority; our views of different authorship render discussion unnecessary. Lardner has adduced various arguments for the priority of the epistle to the Ephesians which are not strong or conclusive, such as the absence of Timothy's name in the salutation, the want of expressions containing hopes of enlargement, as in the epistles to the Colossians, Philippians, and Philemon, with other considerations; while Credner and Reuss have adduced additional ones on the same side. The latter calls special attention to the parallels, Ephes. vi. 18–20; Coloss. iv. 2–4, while Ephes. vi. 10–17 is omitted.[1] But the alleged fact that epistolary repetitions of the same ideas become shorter the second time is questionable. Does not the wordy inferiority of style which Reuss strangely converts into rhetorical fulness and more select expressions, show the later origin of the epistle to the Ephesians? Harless is not very successful in his arguments for the opposite view, such as the word *also* in Ephes. vi. 21, which is thought to refer to the Colossians, to whom he had written the same words as those in Ephes. vi. 21. Internal evidence proves that the epistle to the Colossians was the original. There the thoughts exhibit themselves in their original forma-

[1] Die Geschichte der heiligen Schriften neuen Testaments, p. 103, 2nd ed.

tion and connection; here in a dependent form. There the language is more forcible; here it is weaker and paraphrastic.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

Those who think that Paul wrote the epistle usually put it with the letters addressed to the Colossians, Philemon, and Philippians, as being composed about the same time; and fix upon Caesarea or Rome as the author's locality. On the side of Caesarea are Schulz, Böttger, and Wiggers; on that of Rome, Graul, Olshausen, and Neander. The various arguments adduced by these advocates of the respective places do not concern us. Had the letter proceeded from the apostle, we should have maintained that it was written at Rome, because he had an opportunity of preaching the gospel there, though he was a prisoner, which he cannot be supposed to have enjoyed in Caesarea (Ephes. vi. 19, 20). But as that is disproved, we must fix a later date. How long after the death of Paul did it appear? There are no means of knowing the precise time. We cannot place it, with Schwegler and Baur, about the time of the origination of the fourth gospel, i.e. the middle of the second century, in Asia Minor, or perhaps at Ephesus. Allusions to a period so late, or to the known circumstances of the Church in that century, do not appear. We are not disposed to date it after A.D. 80, or earlier than 70, believing that the author was at Rome not in Asia Minor; that he was a stranger to the church at Ephesus, and knew little more about it than that Paul had founded it, and laboured there for a while. Probably A.D. 75 is the nearest approach to the real date which it is possible to make.

The celebrated Tübingen scholar finds Gnostic and Montanistic references, which bring its origin into the second century. Instead of holding that a disciple of Paul was the writer, he supposes that some speculative

Christian, influenced in part by the incipient Gnosticism of his time, composed it in the apostle's name, confining himself to general ideas, and without a polemic design.[1] A glance at this view must suffice.

In the first place, we cannot agree with Baur's ideas respecting the Pauline christology in the four larger and acknowledged epistles. According to him, the proper nature of the Pauline Christ is human. He is a man, but a spiritual man, one in whom spirit or *pneuma* was the essential principle, so that he was *spirit* as well as *man*. The principle of an ideal humanity existed before Christ in the bright form of a typical man, but was manifested to mankind in the person of Christ. Such is Baur's Pauline Christ.

The subject can only be discussed on the Baconian principle of induction. What then is the resultant of the different passages in those four epistles that speak of Christ's person? Not Baur's view, as we believe, but rather this—that the principle of divinity which is seen in the man Christ existed already in the person of the Son of God, but assumed human nature in the man Christ, by which means it could be manifested to men.

Secondly. As the christology of the Colossian epistle is similar to that of the Ephesian one, Baur consistently denies the authenticity of both. He finds the character of the christology in those epistles metaphysical; whereas the genuine Pauline christology merely *approaches* the metaphysical. In the former the christology is further developed; it is more worked out and refined, becoming a solid and central dogma of the Christian mind. The two epistles direct the view to the transcendental regions of the spirit-world, and show a visible effort to glorify Christ in his higher dignity, with predicates taken from that invisible sphere. They dwell on the pre-existing Christ, rather than the Christ

[1] Baur's Paulus der Apostel Jesu Christi, p. 421, *et seq.*

raised to the Father's right hand. Instead of *ascending* from Jesus the Messiah to the dignity of the pre-existing Son of God, as the four larger epistles do, they *descend* from the latter to the former. They also assert that the heavenly regions are inhabited by angels who are divided into several classes with Christ presiding over them all, an idea not found in the authentic epistles. Hence they are assigned to another than Paul. But something should be allowed for diversities of time, of readers, and of the writer himself. An author may handle the same theme variously, owing to a variety of circumstances in his own and his readers' condition, without furnishing just ground for suspecting the authenticity of the later or earlier work. Apart from this, we cannot see that the author of the Colossian epistle has indulged in theoretical considerations, and made it his object to propound a metaphysical christology. And if *he* has not done so, the writer to the Ephesians has not, else he would have repeated and amplified what had been said before.

Thirdly. When the christology of the two epistles is pronounced metaphysical, and more refined than that of the four preceding ones, the assumption of its later growth and Gnostic form is natural. If it partakes of the character of Gnostic speculation, it belongs to the time when such speculation began to prevail. It arose out of a Gnostic atmosphere, and resembles in part the early systems of Valentinus, Marcion, and others.

The *pleroma* or fulness represented by the aeons among the Gnostics is represented by Christ, who is depicted as the absolute principle of all things, from whom the visible and invisible alike sprang, and in whom all consist; so that he is the centre, as it were, of the universal spiritual kingdom, embracing the visible and invisible worlds within the circle of his power. As the series of aeons represents the unfolding of the nature of the occult God, so Christ, in the two epistles, mirrors

forth the Father. As the Gnostics held that whatever proceeded from God ought to return into his absolute nature; so the epistles to the Colossians and Ephesians indicate that the universe is to be reconciled to God by Christ, and peace established in earth and heaven. This is Baur's view.

Christ, however, is not called *all in all* (Ephes. i. 23)[1] because he derived his origin from all the aeons, as the surname τὰ πάντα was given to the Saviour by the Valentinians because he was produced from the entire pleroma of aeons; but because he reigns over all, Jew and Gentile, barbarian and Scythian, over all nations. As to the restoratory office of Christ, the Valentinian account is, that when Sophia, the aeon most remote from the great original, wandered away from the pleroma, causing perturbation, a new emanation of a pair or syzygy of aeons took place—Christ and the Holy Spirit, in order to restore harmony to the pleroma, and bring back the rest of the aeons to the pristine blessedness of silence. So Baur wishes to show that the epistle assigns to Christ the office of bringing back all that emanated from God and underwent perturbation, to the original state and the source of harmony. But the Christ of the Valentinians composed the perturbation of the aeons at a certain moment of time, before terrestrial things arose outside the pleroma; and all things in heaven and earth were not afterwards united in him as the head. The doctrine of the epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians is different on this point from that of the Gnostics.

Fourthly. The word *pleroma*, which was a leading term among the Gnostics, occurs three times in the letter. We read of *the fulness of God* (iii. 19), and *the fulness of Christ* (iv. 13). In i. 22, 23 *the Church* is termed *the pleroma* or *fulness* of Christ. Why resort to Gnosticism for the source of these words? It throws no light either

[1] τὰ πάντα ἐν πᾶσι.

on their interpretation or use. Is it not more probable that the Gnostics borrowed them from the Pauline writings, and speculated by their aid, running into absurd fancies? The titles attributed to the Church, such as *the fulness* and *the body* of Christ, seem to have been derived from his dignity. The latter epithet is employed in the epistles to the Corinthians and Romans; so that it is not new here; the former arises naturally out of the words applied to Christ in Ephes. i. 23, 'him that filleth all in all.' If Christ fill all things, he fills the Church which depends on him as the head and is directed by his Spirit. To resort to the Gnostic doctrine of *syzygies* or *pairs*, to account for the connection between Christ and the Church, is far-fetched. As with *Propator* or the great first cause existed *ennoia* (self-consciousness), also *monogenes* with *aletheia*; and as male and female aeons were united in marriage, so in the Ephesian epistle Christ and the Church are joined in wedlock. Here are the syzygies of aeons, according to the critic. Surely it is more natural to derive the idea of the union between Christ and his Church from the Old Testament. Equally improbable is the transference of 'the fulness of the godhead,' which was in Christ, to the Church, 'the fulness of Christ.' It is also unnatural to explain, by the Gnostic law of pairs, the derivation of the epithet applied to the Church, 'the body of Christ,' from Coloss. ii. 9, where Christ is *the body* of the godhead.

Fifthly. The Gnostic idea of Christ's descent into hell, Gnostic at least so far as Marcion taught it, is not justified by a correct interpretation of iv. 8. All that the words mean is Christ's descent to earth; and the *leading captivity captive* does not refer to the captives whom Christ freed from Orcus, since the words denote *making captives*, not *setting them at liberty*.

Sixthly. The words *aeon*, *mystery*, *sophia* or wisdom, and *gnosis* or knowledge, do not betray a specifically

Gnostic character, since they are found in the larger Pauline epistles, and in connections adverse to the assumption. The result of our investigation is, that the supposed Gnostic *ideas* and *expressions* are rather the fountain from which the Gnostics drew parts of their system, than the offspring of those systems. Here they occur in a pure and simple form, which they have lost in the developed hypotheses of Marcion, Valentinus, and Basilides. The author has no polemic reference to Gnosticism proper, nor does his epistle breathe a Gnostic air. Had it sprung up amid the fermentations of Gnostic and Montanist ideas, it would have been very different, not merely metaphysical or speculative in general, as far as relates to the person of Christ, but with some at least of those peculiar distinctions which the fancies of the leading Gnostics delighted to draw. One who, so far from intending to oppose Gnosticism, was partially subject to its influence, would scarcely have presented a christology nearly allied to that of Paul, or preserved a remarkable freedom from the minutiae that entered into the systems of the theosophic speculators belonging to the second century.

These observations show that we cannot date the letter so late as the second century. Its peculiar christology and supposed Gnostic allusions do not sustain that conclusion. It owed its birth to the first century, before the changes of thought and manifold speculations which marked the early part of the second century had corrupted the simplicity of the Pauline theology, overloading it with a mass of crudities, and dealing with it in the most arbitrary method.

OCCASION AND OBJECT OF WRITING.

The immediate occasion for writing the letter cannot be discovered. Those who hold it to be Paul's production suppose that the mission of Tychicus and Onesimus

to Colosse suggested the desirableness of sending the former to Ephesus also (vi. 22); or find the occasion in intelligence received from Ephesus. The object of the writer was to advance and strengthen believers in the faith and unity of the gospel. In doing so he sets forth the excellency and glory of redemption, the dignity of the state into which the redeemed are brought by faith, and the conduct becoming their elevation. There are no allusions to false teachers at Ephesus, nor to a Gnostic theosophy against which he wished to guard his readers. The controversial element is absent. A disciple of Paul, seeing that the master had written to the Colossians, not to the Ephesians, intended to supplement the deficiency. The cities of Ephesus and Colosse were in the same parts. As Tychicus bore a letter to the latter place, he might be represented as taking one to the former at the same time. As Paul was a prisoner when he sent the epistle to the Colossians, he might be described as sending one to the Ephesians in the same capacity. So the author would reason. He could personate the master, whose sentiments were familiar to him. Former intercourse had fully introduced him into the Pauline circle of ideas. Above all, he had the Colossian letter as a model. Under these circumstances, he could compose what might be taken as a genuine Pauline work. The unity of the Church was the main idea that occupied his mind, the conciliation of heathenism and Judaism, and their incorporation in one body. This is the ultimate scope of the writer, the union of the separated, an idea that pervades the doctrinal and practical parts alike. It is absent from the Colossian letter. On the contrary, the christological theme of the latter is merely touched in the Ephesian epistle (i. 10, 21–23). Thus a tendency in which the letter may be supposed to have originated is visible. Independent as the production is of local relations—a pastoral epistle addressed to a general public—the im-

portance attached to unity must be connected with its composition. And this fact excites suspicion against its authenticity, suggesting a post-apostolic time, when the holiness and unity of *the Church* became prominent topics, as we see from the Ignatian epistles.

The disciple who wrote it was worthy of the master —a gifted and thoughtful Christian—far-seeing, comprehensive in the range of his ideas, with an inspiration resembling the Pauline. If he suffers by comparison, the wonder is that he sinks so little beside the surpassing greatness of the original. Compared with the epistle to the Colossians, his production is certainly inferior both in thought and diction; viewed by itself, it claims a high place among the canonical epistles. The school of Paul produced none equal to himself; for we can hardly assign the author of the fourth gospel to that school; but there arose out of it apostolic men of enlarged sympathies, some choice spirits on whom the mantle of their departed father fell, reminding us of the prototype. Had there been more of them, they might have carried on the work of Paul with zeal, and built up churches able to resist adverse influences; but they were few and wrote little.

CONTENTS.

The epistle contains a doctrinal and a practical part; the former embracing the first three chapters; the latter, the last three.

The usual salutation (i. 1, 2), is followed by a general thanksgiving to God for His blessings of redemption, consisting of three subdivisions marked by a like ending, 'to the praise of the glory of His grace' (6, 12, 14). In the first, the author mentions the eternal election of a spotless church which is introduced to the privileges of children; in the second, the

realisation of that election by redemption through the blood of Christ on the one hand, and by the announcement of the divine decree of salvation on the other. The fulness of all wisdom lies in the perception of that mystery, whose central point is the person of Christ. Jewish-christians (including the apostle) obtain this salvation agreeably to the divine predestination realised in the Messiah; Gentile Christians, on the ground of their believing reception of a new message to them, through which they are sealed by the Spirit till the day of full redemption (i. 3–14). After this general thanksgiving to God, in which the writer departs from Paul's manner at the commencement of his epistles, he gives special thanks for the faith and love shown by his readers, stating that his unceasing prayer on their behalf was that their knowledge and wisdom might be increased, whence they might learn the greatness of the power exerted in quickening them together with Christ, though formerly dead in trespasses and sins, and be enabled after their new creation to bring forth fruit to the praise of that grace which abounds in all the work of salvation (i. 15–ii. 10).

He reminds his Gentile readers of the blessings which they already experienced. Though they had not previously possessed, like the Jews, a solid hope of salvation, they had attained to a full participation in all the privileges of the theocracy, since the atoning death of Christ had removed the separating barrier of the law, and formed the two portions of the ante-christian world, which were mutually hostile, into one new community, which is based on the foundation of the apostolic announcement of Christ, and becomes an habitation of God through the Spirit (ii. 11–22). All this interrupts the intercession on behalf of his readers begun in i. 17 (ii. 11–22).

Returning to the former prayer for those addressed (iii. 1), he immediately breaks off to tell them how it

is that he is concerned for the Gentile Christians of Ephesus, many of whom were personally unknown to him. They had heard, if not they would see from the present letter, that the mystery now made known respecting the right of the Gentiles to be partakers of salvation had been specially revealed to him; that he had received a commission to preach the gospel, and to announce this mystery to them, that the entire fulness of the divine wisdom might be known in the realisation of the everlasting purpose of God. He has but one wish for them, that they should not be dispirited on account of sufferings endured for their sake; and in a solemn prayer, he asks that they may be replenished with faith, love, and knowledge, to the full measure of their capacity (iii. 1–21). The first part of the epistle closes with the 3rd chapter.

The practical part opens with an exhortation to Christian and ecclesiastical unity, with reference to its subjective as well as objective conditions. God has distributed manifold gifts to bring the Church to its completeness as the body of Christ (iv. 1–16).

He exhorts the readers not to walk after the manner of the heathen, but to be entirely renewed, annexing a series of moral precepts appropriate to Christians in all circumstances (iv. 17–v. 20).

From general relations the author passes to special ones, treating first of the duties belonging to husbands and wives, representing the conjugal connection as similar to that subsisting between Christ and his Church; secondly, of the reciprocal duties of parents and children; and thirdly, of the duties of masters and slaves (v. 21–vi. 9).

The language again becomes general. Believers are described as soldiers fighting for truth and righteousness, whose spiritual armour is minutely stated. In conclusion, he requests an interest in the prayers of the Ephesians, refers them to Tychicus the bearer of the

epistle for information about his personal circumstances, and closes with a benediction (vi. 9–24).

Such is a brief analysis of the epistle.

The difficulties inherent in the treatise are apparent to the critical reader. They are greater than those in the Colossian one, notwithstanding the smoother language. As to the depths beneath depths which some discover, the ideas beneath ideas forming a conglomeration of thought and labouring for utterance, the wonderful and complicated allusions, the spiritual meanings hidden from all but themselves, the logical setting of every word, the part contributed by each phrase to the carrying out of an organic whole, the exact succession and arrangement not only of phrases but of single words—they are largely the offspring of fancy. Minute study is as necessary here as in the case of the epistles to the Romans and Colossians; but such study will never find the exact logical place of every word, or the precise contribution which each phrase in its peculiar position makes to the organic whole. The letter is not a systematic treatise; nor does it bear evidence of artificial polish, either in structure or composition. Its difficulties arise in part from the mistiness of the writer's mind, the vague notions he had about the influence of Christ's redemptive work upon all creatures and about evil spirits, especially from longings after a catholic church united and perfect, pervaded by one doctrine and spirit, animated by faith and love in all its members, a church bringing heaven and earth together in spiritual embrace, the ideal church, which attracts the finest minds in all ages, forming their happy dream of the future. With these feelings the author wrote to instruct. If he had not always as clear conceptions as Paul's, we cannot find fault, though some obscurity must adhere to his meaning on that account. The difficulties belonging to his writing originate in various causes. He had not the ability to body forth

his thoughts with the same freshness as Paul. He paraphrased and compiled. Can we wonder then, that the exegetical difficulties are considerable; that the writer multiplies words; and in departing from his original conveys a less appropriate sense? To speak of an organic whole before his mind, is to conjure up what never existed. An exact adjustment of words and sentences cannot be asserted. His depths beneath depths are non-existent. But this is the language of self-complacent expositors, who pride themselves on possessing a spiritual discernment which they deny to those who differ from them widely—of the traditional upholders of plenary or infallible inspiration.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1847; Meyer, 1865; Bleek, 1865; Harless, 1858; Matthies, 1834; and Olshausen, 1840.

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF PETER.

NOTICES OF THE ALLEGED AUTHOR.

On the western shore of the Sea of Galilee, at Capernaum, lived Andrew and Simon, fishermen, the sons of one Jonas. The former was attracted by the preaching of John the Baptist; there is no evidence that Peter was a disciple also. Andrew brought his brother to Jesus, who gave him the name Cephas or Peter, i.e. a rock. But he continued to be called Simon till after the ascension.

During the life and ministry of their Master, Peter occupied the most prominent position among the apostles, and was honoured with many marks of his confidence. After the ascension, he appears again as the most conspicuous of the brethren. When the church at Jerusalem was scattered by persecution, he was sent with John to Samaria. But the metropolis was his usual place of abode. Having been delivered from prison, he probably left the city (Acts xii. 1–17); and it is not known whither he went, to Caesarea, Antioch, or Arabia. Wherever he was, there is little doubt of his preaching to the Jews. Subsequently we find him again in Jerusalem, at the so-called council (Acts xv.), after which he visited Antioch, where he gave offence by refusing to eat with converted Gentiles, and was openly rebuked by Paul. This is the last time he appears in sacred history.

This first epistle seems to intimate that he was in the Parthian empire, at Babylon.

It is clear that he was married (Luke iv. 38). His house is mentioned in Matthew's gospel (viii. 14). Some suppose the Marcus of the first epistle to have been his son; it is more probable that he was only his *spiritual* son, and is identical with Mark the evangelist.

Ancient witnesses state that he visited Asia Minor, Corinth, and Rome. Origen and Eusebius refer to his activity in Asia Minor; but obviously by inference from 1 Peter i. 1. When, therefore, Epiphanius and Jerome speak of him there with a degree of confidence as if it were historically certain, little value belongs to their statement. Dionysius says that Peter was at Corinth; but though the witness was himself bishop of the place about A.D. 170, it is probable that the opinion was founded upon 1 Cor. i. 12. More importance attaches to the tradition relating to his presence and fate at Rome.

Clement of Rome, in his epistle to the Corinthians, speaks of Paul's martyrdom at Rome, and associates Peter's with it without giving the place.[1]

The document called 'the preaching of Peter,'[2] of the second century, quoted as authoritative by Heracleon and Clemens Alexandrinus, represents the two apostles as being together in Rome.[3] Lactantius quotes it as speaking of their preaching there together.[4]

Dionysius, bishop of Corinth, says that the two apostles planted the church at Corinth; and suffered martyrdom in Italy about the same time.[5]

Irenaeus states that Peter and Paul preached together at Rome, and founded the church there.[6]

Tertullian alludes to Peter's death at Rome;[7] and the presbyter Caius refers to the *trophies*[8] of the apostles near the city, who established the Roman church.[9]

[1] Chapter v.
[2] *κήρυγμα Πέτρου.*
[3] See Credner's Beiträge, i. p. 360.
[4] Institut. Divin. iv. 21.
[5] Ap. Euseb. ii. 25.
[6] Adv. Haeres. iii. 1.
[7] De Praescript. Haereticorum, c. 36
[8] *τὰ τρόπαια.*
[9] Ap. Euseb. ii. 25.

The Clementine homilies imply that Peter died at Rome, but do not state it; all they say is, that he was there;[1] and Origen relates that he was crucified with his head downward.[2] Lactantius's testimony is to the same effect.[3] Eusebius says that Paul was beheaded, and Peter crucified, there.[4] The testimony of John xxi. 19 agrees with this, implying that Peter had already suffered martyrdom by crucifixion.

A tradition in Justin Martyr makes Simon Magus come to Rome in the reign of Claudius, where he received divine honours, and had a statue erected to him with a Latin inscription.[5] The author of the Clementine homilies asserts that Peter came to Rome about the same time, to dispute with him. The two traditions were afterwards united by Eusebius, who states that Peter came to Rome in the reign of Claudius, A.D. 42, where he presided over the church twenty years, according to the Armenian text of his chronicle, or twenty-five according to Jerome's version.[6]

These reports rest on no proper foundation. Justin made a mistake in deciphering the Latin inscription on Simon's supposed pillar.[7] Succeeding writers adopted Eusebius's account; and as Peter and Paul died under Nero, it was inferred that the former visited Rome twice. Jerome following Eusebius, makes Peter occupy the episcopal chair for twenty-five years, which is mere fiction.

The first coming of Peter to Rome in Claudius's reign must be rejected as groundless, since the epistles which Paul wrote from the city show that no apostle had been

[1] See Die Clementinen by Schliemann, p. 108.
[2] Ap. Euseb. iii. 1.
[3] De Morte Persecut. c. 2.
[4] Hist. Eccles. ii. 25.
[5] Apolog. ii. c. 26.
[6] Chronicon, and Hist. Eccles. ii. 17.
[7] He read *Semoni sango* or *sanco*, Simoni sancto; whereas *Semo sancus* or *sangus*, was a Sabine deity. A pillar with the inscription in question was dug up in 1574.

there before, or was there along with him. If Peter was ever at Rome, it could not have been sooner than A.D. 63.

Is the authority for his martyrdom there sufficient? We think not. The statement of Irenaeus about the two apostles founding the Roman church, is manifestly incorrect. Dionysius's testimony deserves no credit, because it contains the false assertion that Peter and Paul founded the Corinthian church; and Caius's appeal to their graves near the city is of little value. How then did the tradition originate? Probably the zeal of the Jewish-christians represented Peter as the founder of the most important church. Some may also have inferred the apostle's residence at Rome from interpreting the Babylon of the epistle mystically. The witnesses are too late to have weight. Clement, perhaps the earliest of them, does not specify the place of martyrdom; and those who do, generally add erroneous particulars. We admit that all speak of the martyrdom; but it was customary to exalt the apostles by making them die that death. In the absence of definite knowledge, early writers assumed a glorious death in honour of the persons they wished to praise. Peter's mode of execution is embellished with the peculiar feature that he was crucified with his head downward, at his own request, not thinking himself worthy to suffer in the same posture with his Master. The growth of tradition is illustrated by the fact, that the deaths of Paul and Peter are said to have taken place on the same day, and in the same year; though the earliest writers merely say that they suffered *about the same time.* Jerome states that they were executed on the same day; and though Augustine places a year between them, holding that they died on the same day of the month only, it came to be universally believed, after Pope Gelasius's time, that they suffered on the same day (June 29), in the same year. Even Dr. Burton declares that the

weight of evidence favours this identity of year and day. The more the basis of the whole tradition is examined, the slighter will it appear. The Babylon of the epistle contributed to it; while it was the interest of the Jewish-christians to put their leader along with Paul in preaching to the church of the imperial city and suffering death under the same emperor. Early Christian writers were credulous and uncritical. They repeated the statements of predecessors and added to them, without much discernment or consistency. To judge fairly of evidence was not their talent. We cannot, therefore, assent to the statement of Schott, that the fact of Peter's presence at Rome is one of the best attested in the later New Testament time.[1]

AUTHENTICITY.

One of the earliest testimonies to the epistle's existence is the second epistle of Peter (iii. 1).

Polycarp knew and used it, as Eusebius relates,[2] and on comparing his epistle to the Philippians with ours, the allusions are more or less apparent. Thus in the 1st chapter: 'In whom, though ye see him not, ye believe, and believing, ye rejoice with joy unspeakable and full of glory' (1 Peter i. 8).[3] Compare also chap. ii. with 1 Peter i. 13–21; iii. 9; chap. v. with 1 Peter ii. 11; chap. x. with ii. 12; chap. viii. with ii. 22, 24; chap. vii. with iv. 1–7.

Eusebius says that Papias knew the epistle.[4]

Irenaeus expressly quotes it. 'And Peter says in his epistle: "Whom not seeing ye love; in whom, not seeing him now, ye have believed; ye will rejoice with

[1] Der erste Brief Petri, p. 348.

[2] H. E. iv. 14.

[3] Εἰς ὃν οὐκ ἰδόντες πιστεύετε, πιστεύοντες δὲ ἀγαλλιᾶσθε χαρᾷ ἀνεκλαλήτῳ καὶ δεδοξασμένῃ, κ.τ.λ.

[4] H. E. iii. 39.

unspeakable joy"' (1 Peter i. 8).[1] Elsewhere he writes: 'And on this account Peter says, that we have not freedom as a cloak of maliciousness, but for the trial and manifestation of faith' (1 Peter ii. 16).[2]

Clement of Alexandria quotes it: 'And Peter in the epistle says the same.'[3] Other allusions are found in the same writer.

In like manner Tertullian refers to our epistle: 'Peter says to the people of Pontus, "How great glory is it, if when ye are punished not for your faults, ye take it patiently! For this is acceptable, and even hereunto ye were called,"' &c. (1 Peter ii. 20, 21).[4] Again: 'Peter had said that the king should be honoured' (ii. 13).[5]

According to Eusebius, Origen called it 'an acknowledged epistle.'[6] The latter quotes it often. Thus on Psalm iii.: 'As Peter says in his catholic epistle, "Whereby he went and preached,"' &c. (1 Peter iii. 19).[7] Again: 'And concerning the journey in spirit to prison in Peter's catholic epistle, "Being put to death," says he, "in the flesh, but quickened in the spirit."'[8] Mayerhoff gives other passages in which

[1] Et Petrus ait in epistola sua: Quem non videntes diligitis, inquit, in quem nunc non videntes credidistis, gaudebitis gaudio inerrabili.—*Adv. Haeres.* iv. 9, 2.

[2] Et propter hoc Petrus ait, Non velamentum malitiae habere nos libertatem, sed ad probationem et manifestationem fidei.—*Ibid.* iv. 16, 5.

[3] Καὶ ὁ Πέτρος ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ τὰ ὅμοια λέγει.—*Stromata*, iii. p. 562, ed. Potter.

[4] Petrus quidem ad Ponticos. Quanta enim, inquit, gloria, si non ut delinquentes puniamini, sustinetis! Haec enim gratia est, in hoc et vocati estis, &c.—*Scorpiac.* c. xii.

[5] Condixerat scilicet Petrus, regem quidem honorandum.—*Ibid.* c. 14.

[6] ἐπιστολὴ ὁμολογουμένη.—*Hist. Eccles.* vi. 25.

[7] κατὰ τὰ λεγόμενα ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ· ἐν ᾧ δὲ τοῖς, κ.τ.λ.—*Opp.* vol. ii. p. 553, ed. Benedict.

[8] καὶ περὶ τῆς ἐν φυλακῇ πορείας μετὰ πνεύματος παρὰ τῷ Πέτρῳ ἐν τῇ καθολικῇ ἐπιστολῇ· Θανατωθεὶς γάρ, φησί, ζωοποιηθείς, κ.τ.λ.—*Ibid.* vol. iv. p. 135.

Origen quotes the epistle. Eusebius puts it among the 'acknowledged' epistles; and it was in the Peshito or old Syriac version as well as in the old Latin.

The letter of the church at Vienne and Lyons uses its language, but does not mention the writer: 'They humbled themselves under the mighty hand by which they are now highly exalted' (1 Peter v. 6).[1] The epistle to Diognetus applies the phrase to God, that He gave 'the just for the unjust' (1 Peter iii. 18).[2]

On the other hand, it is absent from the Muratorian canon, a fact which some critics have tried to supplement or explain away by altering the existing text more or less arbitrarily. It was rejected by the Paulicians, according to Petrus Siculus: 'They do not admit the two catholic epistles of Peter, chief of the apostles, being ill-affected towards him.'[3]

According to Leontius of Byzantium, Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected the epistle.[4]

The authenticity of the epistle is thus attested by external testimonies both ancient and numerous.

Let us consider the internal evidence.

The author was acquainted with several of Paul's epistles, and, recollecting their ideas as well as expressions, inserted them in the work before us. Reminiscences of the letters to the Romans and Ephesians are most apparent.

1 PETER.

Elect, according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, *through sanctification* of the spirit, unto obedience and *sprinkling of the blood* of Jesus Christ (i. 1, &c.).

According as *he hath chosen* us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame . . . in whom we have *redemption* through *his blood* (Ephes. i. 4–7).

[1] Ἐταπείνουν ἑαυτοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν κράταιαν χεῖρα, ὑφ' ἧς ἱκανῶς νῦν εἰσιν ψωμένοι.—Ap. *Euseb. Hist. Eccles.* v. 2.

[2] Bunsen's Analecta Ante-nicaena, vol. i. p. 116.

[3] See Wetstein's N. Test. vol. ii. p. 681.

[4] Contra Nestorianos et Eutychianos, in Canisii Thesauro Monumentor. Eccles. et Hist. vol. i. p. 577, ed. Antwerp. 1725.

1 PETER.

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which . . . . . hath begotten us again, &c. (i. 3).

Not *fashioning yourselves* according to the former *lusts* in your ignorance (i. 14).

Who by him do believe in God, that *raised him up from the dead* (i. 21).

Wherefore, *laying aside* all malice and all guile, and hypocrisies and envies, and all evil speakings, as new-born babes desire the *sincere milk of the word*, that ye may grow thereby . . . . to offer up spiritual sacrifices, *acceptable to God*, &c. (ii. 1, 2, 5).

Behold, *I lay in Sion* a chief corner stone, elect, precious; and he that believeth on him shall not be confounded. Unto you therefore which believe he is precious, but unto them which be disobedient, the stone which the builders disallowed, the same is made the head of the corner, and *a stone of stumbling and a rock of offence* (ii. 6, 7).

Which in time past were not a people, but are now the people of God; which had not obtained mercy, but now have obtained mercy (ii. 10).

Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man, for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as *supreme*; or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for *the punishment* of evil doers, and for the *praise* of them that do well (ii. 13).

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us, &c. (Ephes. i. 3).

And *be not conformed* to this world (Rom. xii. 2).

If we believe on him that *raised up Jesus our* Lord *from the dead* (Rom. iv. 24).

Among whom also we all had our conversation in times past, in the *lusts* of our flesh (Ephes. ii. 3).

But now ye also *put off* all these, anger, wrath, malice, blasphemy (Coloss. iii. 8).

That ye present your bodies a *living sacrifice*, holy, *acceptable unto God*, which is your reasonable service (Rom. xii. 1).

Compare James i. 21.

Behold, *I lay in Sion a stumbling stone and rock of offence*, and whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed (Rom. ix. 33).

As he saith also in Osee, I will call them my people which were not my people; and her beloved, which was not beloved. And it shall come to pass, that in the place where it was said unto them ye are not my people, there shall they be called the children of the living God (Rom. ix. 25, 26).

Let every soul *be subject unto the higher powers*. For there is no power but of God . . . . Do that which is good, and thou shalt have *praise* of the same . . . for he is the minister of God, a *revenger to execute wrath* upon him that doeth evil (Rom. xiii. 1–4).

1 PETER.	
As free, and not using your *liberty* as a cloak of maliciousness (ii. 16).	For brethren ye have been called unto *liberty*; only use not *liberty* for an occasion to the flesh (Gal. v. 13).
Servants, be subject to your masters, *with all fear*, &c. (ii. 18).	Servants, be obedient unto them that are your masters according to the flesh, *with fear*, &c. (Ephes. vi. 5).
That we being dead to sins, should live unto righteousness (ii. 24).	Being then made free from sin, ye became the servants of righteousness (Rom. vi. 18).
Ye wives, be in subjection to your own husbands (iii. 1).	*Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands* (Ephes. v. 22).
Not rendering *evil for evil* (iii. 9).	Recompense to no man *evil for evil* (Rom. xii. 17).
Use hospitality one to another, *without grudging* (iv. 9).	Do all things *without murmurings*, &c. (Phil. ii. 14).
As every man hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold *grace* of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God; if any man *minister*, let him do it as of the ability which God giveth (iv. 10, 11).	Having then *gifts* differing according to *the grace* that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or *ministry*, let us wait on our ministering, &c. (Rom. xii. 6, 7).
And also a partaker of *the glory that shall be revealed* (v. 1).	With *the glory that shall be revealed* in us (Rom. viii. 18).
All of you be *subject one to another* (v. 5).	*Submitting yourselves one to another*, &c. (Ephes. v. 21).
Be sober, be vigilant (v. 8.)	*Let us watch and be sober* (1 Thess. v. 6).
Greet ye one another *with a kiss of charity* (v. 14).	Greet ye one another *with an holy kiss* (1 Cor. xvi. 20).

The doctrinal system, if it may be so called, implied in the epistle, is also essentially Pauline. The author speaks of *election* and *foreknowledge* (i. 2; ii. 9); of *recompense* at the appearing of Jesus Christ, expressed by the word *praise* (i. 7), as in 1 Cor. iv. 5; of *participation* in the sufferings of Christ (iv. 13), as in Phil. iii. 10; compare 2 Cor. i. 5; of an *inheritance* (i. 4), as in Gal. iii. 18; of the abuse of *liberty* (ii. 16), as in Gal. v. 13; of divine *calling* (i. 15), which is a characteristic Pauline doctrine; of moral obedience (i. 2, 14), as in Rom. vi. 16; xvi. 19; and instead of

the 'obedience of faith' (Rom. i. 5), Peter has the 'obedience of truth,' taken from the former. The word rendered *hidden*[1] is a Pauline one, to which *man* is appended, taken from Rom. ii. 16. Instead of 'the hidden things of the heart' (1 Cor. xiv. 25), Peter has the 'hidden man of the heart' (iii. 4). The phrase *in Christ* (iii. 16; v. 10, 14) is also Pauline. The *revelation* of Jesus Christ, referring to his second coming (i. 7, 13; iv. 13), is from 1 Cor. i. 7. The consequence of sin being taken away by the death of Christ is Pauline, though not expressed in the same words, 'to die to sins, and live to righteousness' (1 Peter ii. 24). Paul has *to live to God.*[2]

The general effect which these coincidences produce on the mind is, that the writer had read the epistles to the Romans and Ephesians at least, if not others, and that both their ideas and phraseology became incorporated with his religious consciousness. Pauline views of doctrine and duty formed and moulded his conceptions of Christianity, while the phraseology in which they were clothed was partially accepted. The coincidences are too striking to be resisted, as in the case of iii. 8, &c. compared with Rom. xii. 10, &c., where the same virtues are enjoined by both, Peter specifying none other than such as Paul had mentioned. The order in which they are enumerated is different, but they are the same. Equally convincing is the similarity in ii. 13, &c. compared with Rom. xiii. 1–4, where the same motive for subjection to the ruling powers appears. Even in the example of a quotation from the Old Testament the agreement is remarkable. In ii. 6, 7, and Rom. ix. 33, the citation departs in both instances from the Septuagint and Hebrew. *In him* is added in i. Peter ii. 6 and Rom. ix. 33; Isai. xxviii. 16 is not the

[1] κρυπτός.

[2] See the Greek table in De Wette's Einleitung. The words in italics are the same in the original.

only source used but also viii. 14; the words *stone of stumbling, and rock of offence*, which are identical in the two epistles, being derived from the latter passage and not in the form they have in the Septuagint. The coincidence in 1 Peter i. 3 and Ephes. i. 3, is exact and verbal, corroborating the same conclusion.

Was Peter then a Pauline Christian? Was he dependent on Paul for leading ideas, formulas, and expressions? Had he so little originality as to necessitate recourse to reminiscences of read epistles? Early Christian literature is against the belief that Peter was ever aught else than a Jewish-christian, who retained much of what was distinctive in primitive Christianity. All that we know of him negatives the idea that he developed into an enlarged believer of the Pauline stamp. The early converts who appealed to him as their head set his authority against and above Paul's, considering the two apostles as antagonistic. The Clementine homilies show this. It is therefore wholly improbable that Peter's sentiments became Pauline, as the epistle presents them; or that he possessed so little originality as to borrow largely from other writers. The fact of his using the epistle to the Ephesians is sufficient to disprove his authorship, if we have judged rightly of its post-apostolic origin.

Some critics try to account for all Pauline similarities of thought and diction in the epistle of Peter without the use, direct or indirect, of prior epistles. Of these the most pains-taking is Brückner,[1] who treads closely in the steps of Mayerhoff. But the effort is futile, since the advocates of the Petrine dependence neither represent it as absolute, nor deny diversity by the side of similarity. The coincidences are not of the nature of verbal transcription, but are reminiscences.

[1] In the third edition of De Wette's Erklärung der Briefe des Petrus, Judas und Jacobus, 1865.

Hence ideas and phrases borrowed from Paul may be and are sometimes put in a different connection, or receive a different application. Besides, the author of the epistle, though imbued with Paulinism, was not without some independence or originality. He has features of his own, though not of a high order like Paul's—features consisting in his practical mode of presenting the Pauline system divested of its angular projections and apparent hardness. Paulinism is modified and softened. There are even some deviations from it; or changes of view which point to a stage of development beyond the Pauline. The basis of the author's system is undoubtedly Pauline—for Judaism is represented as a thing of the past, and the Christian church a new kingdom, a divine institution, founded on faith in the redemptive death of Christ—but other aspects of Christianity are given which Paul does not express.

Brückner makes great use of a general Christian consciousness as the source of Petrine ideas and expressions, so that they may not be considered Pauline. Without denying the existence and influence of that common possession, we question the effect attributed to it here, because Peter and Paul represented two sides of primitive Christianity, to which a common Christian consciousness belonged but partially. The Ebionitism of the one, and the universalism of the other, were not fused together while the two apostles lived; though an approach had been made towards the absorption of the former in the latter. The influence of a general Christian consciousness was not far-reaching enough to become the fountain of the Pauline ideas in our epistle, at least in Peter's lifetime.

The argument against authenticity founded on the dependence of Peter on Paul, is strengthened by the fact that James's letter has been used. The resemblances of certain passages in 1 Peter to others in the

so-called epistle of James, are pretty obvious; though explained away by critics of Brückner's school. The following are worthy of notice.

JAMES.	1 PETER.
My brethren, count it all joy when ye fall into diverse temptations; knowing this, that the trying of your faith worketh patience (i. 2, 3).	Wherein ye greatly rejoice, though now for a season, if need be, ye are in heaviness through manifold temptations, that the trial of your faith, &c., &c., might be found unto praise, &c. (i. 6, 7).
Because as the flower of the grass he shall pass away. For the sun is no sooner risen with a burning heat, but it withereth the grass, and the flower thereof falleth (i. 10, 11).	For all flesh is as grass, and all the glory of man as the flower of grass. The grass withereth, and the flower thereof falleth away (i. 24).
Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, &c. (i. 18).	Being born again . . . . by the word of God, &c. (i. 23).
Wherefore he saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace unto the humble . . . . Humble yourselves in the sight of the Lord, and he shall lift you up (iv. 6, 10).	For God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you (v. 5, 6).
He which converteth the sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall hide a multitude of sins (v. 20).[1]	For charity shall cover the multitude of sins (iv. 8).

In these places there is not only a similarity of ideas, but of language. It is true that two of the passages are taken from the Proverbs, but it is unlikely that the coincidence was accidental, because the same conclusion is drawn from the citation in both, at least in James iv. 6 and 1 Peter v. 5. The similarity is so striking, that though it is possible to account for it without assuming that the one writer read the other's production, it is unlikely. The epistle of James preceded that of Peter, as far as we can judge from the coincidence.

The dependence on James, though less than that on Paul, is another item detracting from the originality

[1] See the Greek table in Hug's Einleitung, vol. ii. p. 466, 4th ed.

of Peter, and consequently from his authorship of the epistle. When his independence is encroached upon to a certain extent, he must be withdrawn from the position assigned him by tradition.

To neutralise the objection taken from Peter's dependence on Paul and James, agreement between Peter and John is adduced. *Being born again of incorruptible seed* (i. 23) is like *being born of God*, whose *seed remaineth in* the believer (1 John iii. 9); the word *purify* is the same in i. 22, and 1 John iii. 3; *to live to righteousness* (ii. 24) rests on the same conception of righteousness as *doing righteousness* (1 John iii. 7); *followers of that which is good* (iii. 13) recurs in 3 John 11, connected with the doing of good; the Christian church compared to a flock (v. 2) reminds one of John x. 16; xxi. 16; Christ is *the just* in iii. 18, and 1 John iii. 7; Christ is called *a lamb* in i. 19 and John i. 29. These resemblances appear to be no more than accidental, and are very different from the Pauline ones. It is therefore illogical to infer that the Pauline similarities prove nothing more than they, viz. Peter's independent authorship.

Although the writings of John were not known to the author of our epistle, there is some affinity of ideas between them. The latter speaks strongly against Judaism (ii. 7, &c.), just as John does (vi. 45, &c.; 60, &c.; ix. 39, &c.; xii. 37, &c.). Patience and steadfastness in the midst of suffering are repeatedly inculcated, with reference to the example of Christ (i. 6; ii. 19, 20; iii. 14, 17; iv. 1, 12), &c. So in John xv. 18, &c.; xvi. 1, &c.; 1 John iii. 13. He loves to refer to Isaiah, who announced beforehand the lamb of God (i. 19; ii. 4, 6, 9, 22, &c.), as John does, i. 23, 27; xii. 37. The Spirit of Christ dwelt in the prophets, enabling them to testify beforehand the sufferings of Christ, and the glory that should follow; which agrees with John's saying that Esaias saw Christ's glory, and spake of him (xii. 41). In consequence of this approach to

the characteristic spirit of John's writings, we must suppose that Paulinism was progressing towards its ultimate expression in the Johannine circle of ideas when our author wrote. This is confirmed by its relationship to the epistle to the Hebrews, which is more apparent than any likeness it bears to John. The writer views Christianity as the complement of Judaism, Jerusalem being conceived as the centre of God's kingdom, and the Gentiles in that kingdom outside the metropolis being 'the dispersion.' Like the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews, Peter is disposed to find types in the Old Testament of things of the New, as in iii. 20, &c. Compare Hebr. xi. 7. The dignity of Christians is set forth in ancient formulas (ii. 5, 9, 10; iv. 17). The death of Christ in connection with the bearing of sin, is described in a manner nearer to that of the epistle to the Hebrews and John's gospel, than to Paul. Compare ii. 24 with Hebr. ix. 28—i. 2 with Hebr. xii. 24; ix. 14; x. 22—iii. 18 with Hebr. vii. 24–28—iii. 21 with Hebr. ix. 9–14; and x. 19. Christ is said to have appeared 'in these last times' (i. 20), as in Hebr. i. 2. Whether the author was acquainted with the epistle to the Hebrews, is doubtful; but the affinity of several modes of thought to that production is undeniable. This implies a degree of independence which should not be lessened by overstraining the reliance on Paul; and carries us beyond the lifetime of the apostle to a period when Alexandrian ideas were beginning to influence men's conceptions of Christianity in Palestine; when Paulinism itself was passing onwards to its ultimate development in the Johannine type. The writer hardly stands *midway* between Paul and John, for the objective prevails over the subjective; but he is between the two in time, if not in characteristics.

A thorough comparison of the present epistle with those of Paul, James, and John, instead of furnishing a

remarkable attestation to the one mind which pervades all Scripture, as some allege, or to the one Spirit using the different faculties of men according to their respective gifts, is detrimental to the spiritual authority of an apostle. Were the similarities unconscious ones, a critic might listen to the language of those who love to speak of the one mind, and the unity of faith preserved in Scripture; but since one writer reproduces the sentiments and words of others, the cause of the harmony is not the controlling Spirit of God, but borrowing or imitation.

As an offset to the epistle's dependence on Paul and James, its peculiarities have been carefully collected. Those who think that the writer was a Paulinist need not deny them. Some things are certainly peculiar; such as, the idea of angels desiring to look with curious gaze into the salvation effected by Christ (i. 10–12); Christ's preaching to the spirits in prison (iii. 19, 20); the typification of baptism by the flood, and its being called 'the answer of a good conscience' (iii. 21); Christ's designation as the chief shepherd (v. 4); Christians being strangers and pilgrims (ii. 11); the grounding of an exhortation to good conduct, in the fact of unbelievers acknowledging through it the causelessness of their reproaches (ii. 12; iii. 16); the endurance of wrong being termed a *grace* before God (ii. 20); the presentation of Christ's sufferings as an example of sufferings for the faith (ii. 21, &c.), and of the sufferings of believers as the beginning of judgment (iv. 12); the reference of women to the example of Sarah's subjection to Abraham (iii. 6); and the consolation derived from the similarity of the sufferings endured by Christian brethren (v. 9). The culminating point of Christianity is hope—a well-grounded expectation of future glory.

These peculiarities, however, are few and secondary, not prominent or fundamental. Some of them are

exaggerated by Mayerhoff and Weiss, especially *hope*, so that they call Peter 'the apostle of hope,' as if that attitude of mind was not a part of the common Christian consciousness in early times. If hope were an original feature of the epistle, its central idea and subject, it would stand in closer relation to the second coming of Christ; whereas it assumes no special connection with that event.

The author was one who wished to present the practical side of Paulinism. His spirit is mild and conciliatory. No particular doctrine or view is dwelt upon or defended. He displays no polemic zeal or warmth. With calm moderation he combines different elements of the Christian system, dropping those which seemed hard or sharp, and blending all together with an earnest tone. The production shows little originality, because it has no large views of the world, no important development of individual doctrines. Its originality consists in the judicious practical condensation of sentiments already current; the combination of existing materials into a fresh and attractive shape. As a popular epistle, it has much excellence; and the collection of Christian writings would be imperfect without it. Koestlin's epithet applied to the writer is pretty near the truth, an *eclectic*, whose free elaboration of existing ideas and writings resulted in a peculiar letter.

The conclusion just stated is not weakened by an argument adduced for the authenticity, from the resemblance of ideas and expressions in the epistle to Peter's speeches in the Acts. The allusion to the crucifixion and the use of the word *tree* in Acts v. 30; x. 39; 1 Peter ii. 24; the peculiar application of the term *witness* in Acts ii. 32; iii. 15; 1 Peter v. 1; the connection of the old prophets with the work of Christ in Acts iii. 18; x. 43; 1 Peter i. 10; the phrase, 'judge quick and dead' in Acts x. 42; 1 Peter iv. 51;

the clauses, *the faith which is by him*, *the faithful* or *believers by him* in Acts iii. 16; 1 Peter i. 21,—are also specified as cognates. The argument would be more plausible, if the speeches of Peter in the Acts were verbally repeated, an opinion which few maintain. On the contrary, they have been reproduced with freedom. Their sentiments and language are conformed to Paul's. Hence the alleged similarity in type of doctrine, array of facts, and style, between this epistle and Peter's speeches in the Acts, is of no account. Slight as it is at the best, apologists zealously magnify it into a peculiar and striking coincidence.

It is improbable that Peter should write to the churches of Pontus, Cappadocia, and Bithynia, which Paul had founded and instructed; at least while the apostle himself was alive. If he were in Babylon on the Euphrates as many think, he could know very little of their state. It is assumed, indeed, that Mark had gone from Asia Minor to Babylon, and told him about the condition of the Christians in the countries referred to; but that is conjecture. Nor is the difficulty removed by supposing, with Brückner, that Mark had been with Peter before he went back to Paul, after the separation referred to in Acts xv. 39; a supposition altogether gratuitous. The salutation makes no mention of Mark's late presence in Asia Minor; nor does the epistle allude to the writer's information respecting the churches being received through Mark. On the contrary, the expression, 'Marcus, my son,' looks as if the churches knew little about Peter's companion. If Paul was a prisoner in Rome when Peter wrote to these Christians, it is strange that he should never allude to that fact; though it was one which would excite their sympathy. And if the apostle of the Gentiles was still travelling about, why should the apostle of the circumcision write to communities consisting for the most part of Gentiles? As soon as we try to

get an intelligible or consistent view of Peter writing to these Pauline churches from Babylon while Mark was with him; either immediately before Paul's imprisonment or after it, the field of historical probability must be abandoned.

It is not likely that Peter knew Greek so well as to be able to write the epistle. His native dialect was Aramaean, which he would not lay aside, as long as he addressed the Jewish-christians of Palestine. If he ever went to Babylon, it was on account of the Hebrew Christians there, who spoke the same language. Hence it is not surprising, that several critics suppose the epistle not to have proceeded from the apostle in its present form, but that it was translated out of Aramaean by Silvanus or Mark. Jerome speaks of Peter using 'different interpreters' in the two epistles, because of their different style; while Eichhorn assumes that Mark put Peter's ideas into their present shape. The expression, 'I have written by Silvanus' (v. 12), might even be applied to Peter's dictation of the letter to Silvanus his amanuensis; but had he been the translator, we should have expected a salutation from him. The epistle bears no marks of a version; and in the absence of contrary testimony, we must hold that it was written in Greek. Hence Peter's authorship becomes improbable, Aramaean being the tongue he used. The conjecture of those who give him a helper in the composition, is an admission of the improbability. In iii. 20 the writer states, that Christ, after his death, went to the under-world, where the fallen angels were confined, and proclaimed to them the coming judgment, of which he was the executor. This opinion is later than Paul, reminding the reader of what the Ephesian epistle says, respecting Christ descending to the lower parts of the earth (iv. 9, 10), though nothing is there stated of what he did in hades. The non-apostolic date of the epistle would follow still more clearly from

iii. 19, if he who preached to the dead in iv. 6, were the apostle Peter, an idea found in the 'Shepherd' of Hermas.[1] But it is not said *by whom* the gospel was preached. In any case, *preaching to the dead* is a different thing from *the announcement to the angels* in iii. 19. The verbs in the two places are not equivalent;[2] neither has Brückner proved that they are. The *spirits* also are distinct from the *dead.*

TIME AND PLACE.

The date of the letter cannot be fixed. It was after the epistle to the Ephesians. It may therefore be between A.D. 75 and 80. The place was probably Rome, the mystical Babylon whence Peter is supposed to address scattered believers. Babylon on the Euphrates would naturally be understood as the locality of the writer, if he were Peter; though it is unlikely that he ever was there. At least, ecclesiastical history is silent respecting his sojourn in Babylonia. On the other hand, the testimony of antiquity is favourable to Rome. Papias, and Clement of Alexandria understood Babylon to be that city. The objection that a mystical appellation is unsuitable to an epistle, is of no weight. An author personating Peter might well use a metaphorical appellation for the supposed place of his abode.

The connection of Peter with Rome, though it appears in early ecclesiastical literature, rests on an insecure basis. Distinguished critics reject it, not without reason.

Indications of date have been found in the contents. Some, as Mayerhoff and Neander, suppose that the Neronian persecution had begun; an opinion that brings the composition of the epistle after July 19th, A.D. 64. Others think that the persecution was only apprehended;

[1] Lib. iii. Sim. ix. 16.

[2] κηρύττειν and εὐαγγελίζειν.

and date the letter earlier. The decision depends on the interpretation of various passages: i. 6; ii. 12; iii. 13–17; iv. 12–19; v. 6–10; especially on iii. 15, 16; iv. 4, 5, 16–19; v. 9. The word rendered *answer* in iii. 15, does not necessarily suggest the idea of *judicial investigations* by the imperial power. It is true that the hopes of the early Christians respecting Christ's kingdom, awakened the suspicion of the heathen, as in the case of Domitian; but the language of the verse is too general to be restricted to formal defences before the Roman emperor. Besides, the exhortation points to future conduct, rather than to the fact of those addressed being then dragged before the imperial tribunals or provincial magistrates. It has been inferred from the sixteenth verse, that the Christians were branded as *evil-doers*, so that the name *Christian* denoted one deserving punishment, which did not occur till the tenth consulate of Nero's reign when the Christians were first persecuted as a peculiar sect. But it is not clear that the epithet *evil-doers* should be understood as equivalent to the *malefici* of Tacitus, as though it meant a state-criminal, or one guilty of treason. Rather does it signify an evil-doer generally. Mayerhoff and Neander infer from iv. 4, 5, that those addressed had rendered themselves obnoxious to the heathen populace, by withdrawing from the public shows and other licentious amusements.

The remarks already made upon iii. 15, 16, will explain iv. 15, 16. *To suffer as a Christian*, signifies no more than exposure to reproach or persecution for the religion of Christ.

The true sense of v. 9 is this: 'whom resist, steadfast in faith; with the persuasion that the same sufferings are accomplished or fulfilled as God's decree, among your brethren, in the unbelieving hostile world.' Such trials were the lot of the whole brotherhood.

None of the passages cited contains clear evidence

that bloody persecutions like Nero's, A.D. 64, had begun. A fair interpretation of the whole letter shows that no systematic or general persecution had taken place. Though the trials which these Christians had to suffer, came chiefly from heathens not Jews, they were more apprehended than actually endured.

A severe time was approaching. Judgment was soon to begin at the house of God. The statements in question agree with the time of Nero's reign immediately preceding his terrible persecution of the Christians, when he began to show his true temper, concealed as it had been for the first five years. Sore as the trials were to which the readers were subjected, heavier ones awaited them. But the description will apply to a time much later than the Neronian persecutions. Though we cannot, with Schwegler[1] and Baur, refer them to the calamities in Trajan's reign, they need not point to any specific time. Indeed they are too general to admit of restriction to one period in particular. The date of the epistle cannot be ascertained by their means, because of their indefiniteness—a feature purposely belonging to the language. The mention of the dispersion (i. 1) does not show that Jerusalem was still standing as the centre of divine worship, because the writer taking Christianity to be the consummation of Judaism, regards *spiritual* Jerusalem as the centre of God's kingdom. We despair of fixing the date by the help of any place in the epistle that alludes to the sufferings of the Christians, present or impending. Critics are greatly divided in opinion as to the time of writing, A.D. 46, 48, 60, 62, 64, 65, 69, and the beginning of the second century being assigned. The means of arriving at a probable conclusion are scanty and uncertain, as long as the epistle is divested of designed coincidences with that of James and the Ephesian one.

[1] Das nachapostolische Zeitalter, vol. ii. p. 10, *et seq.*

Weiss's attempt to date it before Paul's third missionary journey is involved in inextricable difficulties.

PERSONS ADDRESSED.

The letter itself addresses 'the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia,' &c. Here the word translated *strangers*[1] is of doubtful meaning. It signifies a sojourner, one who stays for a short time in a strange place; and should be taken metaphorically. Weiss, who argues at great length, that the epistle was addressed to Jewish-christians, relies on the following words, 'scattered through Pontus,' &c., for proof that the Jewish believers in the five provinces specified were the parties intended.[2] But Gentile readers are implied in the letter itself (i. 14, 18; ii. 9, 10; iii. 6; iv. 3). Though some of these passages may appear ambiguous, because of the Jewish phraseology employed; the author's manner, which is to speak of Christianity as the consummation of Judaism, and Gentile Christians as the spiritual Israel, explains them. We know from the Acts of the Apostles and Paul's epistles, that the churches in Asia Minor mainly consisted of Gentile converts. It is likely too, that those of the other four countries specified were substantially composed of Gentiles. If therefore the writer addresses Gentile churches, the word *stranger* must be taken symbolically or typically for *Gentile pilgrims* or *sojourners*, those absent from the spiritual centre of God's kingdom on earth, from the Christian Jerusalem. In this way the epithet applies to Gentile Christians, for whom we believe the author intended it. The spiritual idea of pilgrimage is predominant in the epithet; and the following word, *dispersion*[3] belongs as much to the

[1] παρεπιδήμοις.

[2] Der Petrinische Lehrbegriff, p. 29.

[3] διασπορά.

noun before, as to the proper names succeeding it. The language cannot be taken literally, denoting Jews in strange lands, without contradicting the contents of the letter. Neither can the word *strangers* be restricted, with Credner, to proselytes, those of Gentile extraction who had embraced Judaism before turning to Christianity, for proselytes were otherwise styled.[1] That there were some Jews and some proselytes in these communities is probable enough; but they were the smaller number. The Pauline churches were chiefly Gentile.

OBJECT.

At the close of the letter the author says, 'By Silvanus, a faithful brother unto you as I suppose, I have written briefly, exhorting and testifying that this is the true grace of God wherein ye stand,' intimating that his design was to assure them of the truth they had received from the lips of Paul and his fellow-workers being the unchangeable word of God, the source of animating hope and permanent comfort, which they should appropriate with the simplicity of new-born babes, that they might grow up to Christian maturity. Thus he intended to confirm them in the faith which Paul taught. It was also included in his design to exhort them to steadfastness under the trials to which they were exposed, to give consolation, and to regulate their conduct towards the heathen around; that they might be sober, holy, harmless, silencing their persecutors with well-doing. The greater part of the letter has to do with the latter aspect of the design; from which we infer that the relation they bore to the heathens was a critical one. Suspicion, jealousy, and oppression from those without, fell to the lot of these Christians. In such circumstances the writer counselled

[1] προσήλυτοι, εὐλαβεῖς, φοβούμενοι.

them about their conduct, and the way in which they should meet the hatred of enemies. As they had been already grounded in the doctrines of Christianity, the letter is not doctrinal. Neither does it enter into the peculiarities of their inner life or experience. Perhaps the author did not know them well enough to do that. He contents himself with general admonitions to steadfastness.

It is impossible to discover any *specific occasion* that gave rise to the epistle. The relations of the author to his readers are not definite. Credner,[1] indeed, appeals to i. 1, 23, 25; ii. 11; v. 1, 12, 13, as proof that the Christians addressed had an accurate acquaintance with the writer and his affairs; but the passages in question do not reveal the fact; much less do they imply that he had laboured in the gospel for their benefit, and in their midst. They show that he took an interest in their welfare, and that he knew their general condition, with the trials they were exposed to; but there are no traces of personal work among them; nothing definite in their circumstances prompting him to write. The picture is drawn in broad outlines; just as the individuality of the author himself is indistinct. He confines himself to generals, so that his production has little of the peculiar or personal character.

GENERAL CHARACTER, STYLE, AND DICTION.

Steiger[2] finds in the epistle great facility of expression and ease in linking ideas together. The case does not appear to us in the same light. The language is somewhat rugged, and the author's control over it incomplete. He uses it with a degree of embarassment, which influences the development of his ideas

[1] Einleitung, p. 640.

[2] Exposition of the First Epistle of Peter, &c. vol. i. pp. 7, 8, English translation.

unfavourably. The consecution of thought is not logical. New ideas are attached to a word by means of a relative pronoun, which gives the style a limping appearance. The sequence of ideas, such as it is, has been well traced by Seyler in the first twelve verses, where it is least apparent;[1] and it is observable in the remainder of the epistle.

The diction is not devoid of strength, but rough; and the construction is commonly obvious, though often constrained. The author repeats the same sentiments, in identical or similar words, oftener than Paul. Compare, for example, iii. 16 with ii. 12; iii. 1—iv. 3 with i. 14; ii. 11—iv. 12 with i. 6–9—iv. 14 with ii. 20; iii. 14. 17—v. 8 with iv. 7; i. 13. He likes to employ the preposition *to* with the accusative of a person (i. 4, 10, 11, 25); to separate the article from its noun (iii. 2, 3, 16); to use the particle *as* (i. 14, 19; ii. 2, 5, 11–14, 16, 25; iii. 6, 7; iv. 10–12, 15, 16; v. 3, 8, 12); and to apply a participle, not only with an imperative either before or after it, but absolutely, without any finite verb (i. 13, 14, 18, 22, 23; ii. 1, 4, 12, 16, 18; iii. 1, 7, 9, 16; iv. 8; v. 7). In no other writer do we meet with *glories* (i. 11), or *virtues* in the plural number (ii. 9); and with *the same sufferings* (v. 9)[2] so expressed. In citing the Old Testament the phrase *it is contained in Scripture* (ii. 6)[3] is singular. *The Spirit of God rests* (iv. 14); *the loins of the mind* (i. 13); *to distribute honour* (iii. 7), are also phrases peculiar to the writer. He has favourite words;[4] and the number of terms which occur in his epistle alone is large.[5]

[1] Studien und Kritiken for 1832, p. 44, *et seq.*

[2] *τὰ αὐτὰ τῶν παθημάτων.*

[3] *περιέχει ἐν τῇ γραφῇ.*

[4] as *ἀναστροφή*, *κακοποιός*.

[5] So called *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, as *ἀδελφότης*, *ἄδολος*, *ἀναγεννᾶν*, *αἰσχροκερδῶς*, *ἀλλοτριοεπίσκοπος*, *ἀμαράντινος*, *ἀμάραντος*, *ἀναγκαστῶς*, *ἀναζώννυσθαι*, *ἀνάχυσις*, *ἀνεκλάλητος*, *ἀνθρωπίνη κτίσις*, *ἀντιλοιδορεῖν*,

It is not uncommon to trace Peter's mental idiosyncracy in the manner, style, and language of the letter, after it has been assumed that he wrote it. Fervour has been pronounced its chief characteristic, from Chrysostom downward. The author hurries on, says what he has to say in any words that come soonest, stamps the image of his soul on thoughts and language, pourtrays the profound emotions that swayed him, his earnest convictions, and thorough zeal. Such description is the offspring of imagination. The writer is calm, serene, zealous but mild, earnest and lively, not fervid. He does not hurry along. Instead of stamping the image of his soul upon the letter, it is obvious that he lacked the profundity of emotion and intensity of purpose which alone could impart a living impress to the production. The very trait most absent from the letter is a distinct individuality. We admit that tokens of individual character and independence are found here and there, but they are of a minor kind, having their basis in Paulinism and consisting of details. The body of Christian doctrine on which he builds is Paul's, interpenetrated with his own remarks; the practical side of it being presented after his own fashion. To speak therefore of 'a Petrine doctrinal system,'[1] or to find one in the epistle, is preposterous. The author's manner is fresh, but passionless, more placid and chastened than we might expect from Peter. He is cheerful, consolatory, and hopeful. We do not say that Peter could not have written the letter, for

ἀπογίνεσθαι, ἀπονέμειν, ἀρτιγέννητος, ἀπροσωπολήπτως, ἀρχιποίμην, ἀθέμιτος, βιοῦν, βασίλειος, γυναικεῖος, ἐπιμαρτυρεῖν, ἐπερώτημα, ἐμπλοκή, ἔνδυσις, ἔννοια sing., ἐξαγγέλλειν, ἐποπτύειν, ἐπικάλυμμα, ἐπίλοιπος, ἐγκομβοῦσθαι, ἐπιτελεῖσθαι, ἐξερευνᾶν, ἱεράτευμα, κλέος, κραταιός, ὁμόφρων, ὁπλίζεσθαι, οἰνοφλυγία, πτόησις, προμαρτύρεσθαι, περίθεσις, πότος, παροπαράδοτος, προθύμως, ῥύπος, συνοικεῖν, συνεκλεκτή, συμπαθής, σθενοῦν, σπορά, συμπρεσβύτερος, ὑπολιμπάνειν, ὑπογραμμός, φιλάδελφος, ὠρύεσθαι, nearly sixty in all.

[1] Petrinische Lehrbegriff.

it is hazardous to judge of one's composition and pronounce it authentic or not from a few personal traits; but the absence of definite personality, and its subdued tone, make his authorship improbable. The fiery vigour of the apostle is not reflected. The head of the Jewish-christians must have greatly changed, if he became the conciliatory expounder of a practical Paulinism.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

Steiger states truly that a logically-arranged table of all the contents can scarcely be given. The author passes from one thing to another, not without steady advance, but insensibly. A sequence of ideas can be traced, though it is irregular.

Perhaps the best division is into two parts, exclusive of the salutation, introduction, and concluding verses, the former containing general, the latter particular exhortations, viz. i. 13–ii. 10, and ii. 11–v. 11.

The inscription and salutation are in verses 1, 2.

In the introduction the author expresses gratitude to God for the abundant blessings of salvation bestowed on himself and his readers, reminding them of the conflict which Christians have to endure; and taking it for granted that they were conducting themselves so that it should issue in complete salvation in the day of Christ's manifestation. The mention of salvation leads him to mark its importance by the fact, that the old prophets were earnestly desirous to know the time to which the spirit of prophecy respecting Christ pointed; and that the angels themselves were eager to look into it (i. 3–12).

A series of general admonitions follows. He exhorts the Christians of Asia Minor to a watchful and perfect hope in the favour to be brought to them at the future appearance of Christ; to obedience and holiness, since

he that called them is holy, and because they should fear their judge, recollecting the atoning death of Christ, who was foreordained from eternity but appeared in the latter time for the benefit of believers. He counsels them still farther to holiness and especially to brotherly love, by bringing to their recollection the regenerated state into which they were introduced by the instrumentality of the living word, which he proves to abide for ever by reference to the Old Testament (i. 13–25).

The writer further exhorts them to growth in the new life, if indeed they had begun to experience the grace of God, reminding them that they formed part of the spiritual temple of which Jesus Christ is the corner-stone; and that they were the officiating priests in it to offer spiritual sacrifices. This is established by an appeal to the Old Testament; whence he draws the conclusion that the honour is to believers, while danger and destruction await the disobedient. Resuming the description of Christians contained in a preceding verse, he represents them as a peculiar people, who had obtained mercy (ii. 1–10).

The second division consists of a series of special exhortations, bearing on the external and internal relations of those addressed (ii. 11–v. 11).

The author counsels his readers to maintain a good life among the heathen, that their adversaries might be led to glorify God, and submit to the civil government they were under; for though spiritually free, they should not abuse their liberty. On the contrary, they were bound to treat all with due respect (ii. 12–17).

Slaves are enjoined to obey their masters, and to be patient under the ills of their lot, since they were called for this very purpose that they should exhibit a spirit of meek endurance under the pressure of suffering, in accordance with the example of Christ who bore the

penalty for our sins and brought us back to his fold (ii. 18–25).

Wives are exhorted to obey their husbands; and instead of priding themselves on outward decorations, to attract by mental charms. This is enforced by the examples of holy women under the old dispensation, and of Sarah in particular, whose daughters Gentile women become when they do right, and have no fear of threatenings without (iii. 1–6).

Husbands are admonished to honour and respect the wife as the weaker vessel (iii. 7).

By way of conclusion, the author subjoins a general exhortation respecting unanimity, sympathy, brotherly love, mercifulness, courtesy, returning good for evil, speaking peace instead of speaking guile; reminding them that God rewards the good and punishes the evil (iii. 8–12).

He now exhorts them to the exercise of a fearless, meek, and patient spirit in the prospect of suffering, founded on the possession of a good conscience; referring for their encouragement to the sufferings and resurrection of Christ, who, when put to death in the body, lived in spirit and preached to the fallen angels who had been disobedient till the flood. In like manner through baptism, in a mode similar to that in which Noah and his family were rescued, a small number are now saved by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, who is gone to the right hand of God (iii. 13–22).

This leads to encouraging counsel. Since Christ suffered for sinners, they should exhibit the fortitude and patience he displayed; for the man who bears his sufferings with a Christian spirit ceases to sin habitually, that he may live after the will of God. Believers should not indulge fleshly lusts after the manner of the heathen (iv. 1–3).

As their holy conduct had brought the displeasure

of the Gentiles upon them, they are referred to the judgment, when they and their accusers should receive a righteous sentence. And because the judgment is at hand, he enjoins them to be sober and watchful; to have fervent charity towards one another; to be hospitable, each employing his gift for the benefit of others; for example, the teacher or prophet uttering the words of God not his own opinions, and every one ministering out of the ability given him, that God might be glorified in all his instruments (iv. 4–11).

The writer encourages his readers to bear the trial to which God should subject them, with joyful spirit. If they were reproached for Christ's sake they were happy, inasmuch as the Spirit was in them as a spirit of glory and power. They should be careful, however, not to suffer in a bad cause but as followers of Christ; not ashamed, but rather praising God in this respect (iv. 12–16).

The necessity of bearing the judgment which began to threaten the unbelieving, serves to console the suffering (iv. 17–19).

He now addresses the elders of the churches, enjoining them to attend to their duties spontaneously, not for the sake of money, not lording it over the churches, but being examples to the flock, remembering that their reward would come from the chief Shepherd. The younger should be subject to the elder, none seeking to exercise authority over the rest, but all clothed with humility (v. 1–5).

The closing exhortation relates to humble submission to God's will, sobriety, and watchfulness against the great adversary, whom they are commanded to resist with steadfast faith. To this is appended a prayer for the confirmation of his readers in the truth, with a doxology (v. 6–11).

The conclusion alludes to Silvanus as bearer of the

letter; and salutations are sent from the church at Babylon and Mark (v. 12–14).

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1865; Huther, 1860; Wiesinger, 1856; Steiger, 1832; Fronmüller, 1859; Schott, 1861; and Brown (Expository Discourses), 1849.

THE EPISTLE OF JUDE.

AUTHORSHIP.

THE WRITER of this epistle styles himself Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ and brother of James. Several persons named Judas or Jude are mentioned in the New Testament, only two of whom at present come before us, viz. Jude, a brother of our Lord, spoken of in Matt. xiii. 55; Mark vi. 3, and another referred to in Luke vi. 16; Acts i. 13. The latter is called *brother* of James in the English version; but his relationship to James is not specified in the Greek original. He may have been *the son* of James, i.e. of James the son of Alphaeus, or the son of another James.

It is generally admitted that when Jude describes himself as a brother of James, he points to a well-known James, i.e. the James often called bishop of Jerusalem, who was the Lord's brother. The writer was not an apostle, and does not say he was. He styles himself brother of James. Why should he call himself brother of another person, if he possessed independent authority and apostleship? It is of no avail to say that Paul omits the title *apostle* in several of his epistles, because the cases are dissimilar. It was well known from some of his letters who he was; whereas Jude wrote no more than one brief epistle.[1] We cannot therefore identify the present Jude with the apostle Jude or Judas

[1] Jessien, De Authentia Epistolae Judae commentatio critica, p. 2, *et seq.*

surnamed Lebbeus or Thaddeus, though the latter is termed 'brother of James' in Luke vi. 16, in our English version. Besides, he distinguishes himself from the apostles: 'But, beloved, remember ye the words which were spoken before of the apostles of our Lord Jesus Christ; how that *they* told you there should be mockers in the last time, who should walk after their own ungodly lusts' (verses 17, 18). The reasoning of Arnaud on this language is far-fetched: 'He distinguishes himself from the apostles as an individual, but not necessarily as to his class, that is to say, his rank as an apostle.'[1] Is not that special pleading? Some think that he would have called himself the Lord's brother, had he really been so, because the circumstance would have given weight to his letter; but we cannot tell the reasons that may have influenced him, whether humility and a sense of the altered relation between the Son of God and himself, as has been conjectured. The language of Hegesippus implies that he was esteemed on account of his relationship to Christ, and was dead in the time of Domitian.[2]

AUTHENTICITY.

Clement of Alexandria refers to the epistle in the following places: 'For I would have you know, says Jude, that God once,' &c., &c.[3] In another place he writes: 'It was respecting these, I suppose, and similar heresies, that Jude in his epistle said prophetically,' &c.[4] Eusebius says of him, 'In his outlines, Clement had made short explanations of all the canonical Scriptures,

[1] On the Authorship of the Epistle of Jude, translated in the British and Foreign Evangelical Review for 1859, p. 497 and following.

[2] Ap. Eusebius's H. E. iii. 20.

[3] Εἰδέναι γὰρ ὑμᾶς, φησὶν ὁ Ἰούδας, βούλομαι, ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἅπαξ, κ.τ.λ.—*Paedagog.* lib. iii. p. 239, ed. Sylburg.

[4] Ἐπὶ τούτων οἶμαι καὶ τῶν ὁμοίων αἱρέσεων προφητικῶς Ἰούδαν ἐν τῇ ἐπιστολῇ εἰρηκέναι.—*Stromata*, iii. p. 431.

not omitting those which are disputed, I mean Jude's and the other catholic epistles.'[1] Clement seems to have used the epistle as an apostolic one, though he does not call the writer an apostle.

Tertullian thought that it was written by an apostle: 'Enoch possesses a testimony in Jude the apostle.'[2]

The Muratorian fragment on the canon speaks uncertainly about the epistle, the text being probably corrupt in the place.[3] Credner understands the writer to say that the two epistles of John and that of Jude have a place in the canon, on the same ground as that on which the Wisdom of Solomon was admitted into the Christian, though excluded from the Jewish, canon. But Wieseler interprets the meaning as if the epistle of Jude and others were received in the catholic Church.

Origen writes: 'Jude wrote a letter, of few verses indeed, but full of powerful words of heavenly grace,' &c.[4] In another place: 'But if any one receives also the epistle of Jude, let him consider what will follow from what is there said,' &c.[5] 'And many of the heavenly beings, even of the first, become the last, being kept in everlasting chains in darkness unto the judgment of the great day.'[6] 'And in the epistle of

[1] Ἐν δὲ ταῖς ὑποτυπώσεσι πάσης τῆς ἐνδιαθήκου γραφῆς ἐπιτετμημένας πεποίηται διηγήσεις, μὴ δὲ τὰς ἀντιλεγομένας παρελθών· τὴν Ἰούδα λέγω καὶ τὰς λοιπὰς καθολικὰς ἐπιστολάς.—*H. E.* vi. 14.

[2] Enoch apud Judam apostolum testimonium possidet.—*De Habitu Foeminarum*, c. 3.

[3] Epistola sane Judae et superscripti Johannis duas in catholica habentur. 'In catholica' means *in the catholic Church*, ecclesia being understood. But Bunsen alters *catholica* into catholicis, and then the sense is, that the Epistle of Jude and 1 & 2 John are reckoned among the catholic epistles.

[4] Ἰούδας ἔγραψεν ἐπιστολὴν ὀλιγόστιχον μέν, πεπληρωμένην δὲ τῶν τῆς οὐρανίου χάριτος ἐρρωμένων λόγων.—*Comment. in Matt.* vol. iii. p. 463, ed. Delarue.

[5] Εἰ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἰούδα πρόσοιτό τις ἐπιστολήν, ὁράτω τί ἕπεται τῷ λύγῳ, διὰ τὸ ἀγγέλους τε, κ.τ.λ.—*Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 814.

[6] Καὶ γίγνονται πολλοὶ μὲν τῶν οὐρανίων καὶ πρώτων ἔσχατοι, εἰς κρίσιν μεγάλης ἡμέρας δεσμοῖς ἀϊδίοις ἐν ζόφῳ τηρούμενοι.—*Ibid.* vol. iii. p. 693.

Jude, "To them that are beloved in God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called."'[1] In other parts of his works existing in a Latin translation only, Origen calls Jude an *apostle*, and quotes his letter as *divine Scripture*.[2]

Eusebius puts the epistle among the *controverted* books, saying of it: 'Of the controverted, but yet well known to many, are that called the Epistle of James, that of Jude,' &c.[3] Again: 'Not many of the ancients have made mention of it [the epistle of James], neither of that called Jude's, which is likewise one of the epistles termed *catholic*. We know, however, that these also are publicly read in most churches along with the rest.'[4]

Jerome writes: 'Jude, the brother of James, left a small epistle indeed, which belongs to the seven catholic ones. And because in it he takes a testimony from the book of Enoch which is apocryphal, it is rejected by most. However, it has already obtained such authority by antiquity and use, that it is reckoned among the sacred Scriptures.'[5]

It is also quoted as Scripture in the treatise of an unknown author addressed to Novatian (sicut scriptum est, Jude 14, 15.)[6]

[1] Καὶ ἐν τῇ Ἰούδα ἐπιστολῇ, τοῖς ἐν Θεῷ πατρὶ ἠγαπημένοις, καὶ Ἰησοῦ Χριστῷ τετερημένοις κλητοῖς.—*Comment in Matt.* p. 607, ed. Delarue.

[2] Comp. Comment. in Ep. ad Rom. lib. iii.—*Opp.* iv. p. 510. Ibid. lib. iv. p. 549; De Principiis, iii. 2 (tom. i. p. 138).

[3] τῶν δ' ἀντιλεγομένων, γνωρίμων δ' οὖν ὅμως τοῖς πολλοῖς, ἡ λεγομένη Ἰακώβου φέρεται, καὶ ἡ Ἰούδα, κ.τ.λ.—*H. E.* iii. 25.

[4] οὐ πολλοὶ γοῦν τῶν παλαιῶν αὐτῆς ἐμνημόνευσαν, ὡς οὐδὲ τῆς λεγομένης Ἰούδα, μιᾶς καὶ αὐτῆς οὔσης τῶν ἑπτὰ λεγομένων καθολικῶν· ὅμως δὲ ἴσμεν καὶ ταύτας μετὰ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐν πλείσταις δεδημοσιουμένας ἐκκλησίαις.—*H. E.* ii. 23.

[5] Judas frater Jacobi, parvam quidem, quae de septem catholicis est, epistolam reliquit. Et quia de libro Enoch, qui apocryphus est, in ea assumit testimonium, a plerisque rejicitur: tamen auctoritatem vetustate jam et usu meruit, ut inter sacras Scripturas computetur.—*Catal. Script. Eccles.* c. 4.

[6] Adv. Novat. Haeret. page xvii. ed. Baluz, 1726.

On the other hand, the epistle is wanting in the Peshito. But Ephrem departed from the Church's opinion in recognising the apostolic origin. Justin Martyr, Theophilus of Antioch, and Irenaeus do not mention it.

During the fourth century, the letter was taken into the canon along with other disputed works, and was thenceforward treated like the epistles of apostolic origin. Theodore of Mopsuestia rejected it, according to Leontius of Byzantium.

External evidence is in favour of its being written by Jude, not by an apostle. Nor is there anything against its authenticity in the work itself. It was composed by one closely connected with apostles, Jude, the brother of James. The objections to its Jude-authorship are not strong. It is said—

First. That an apocryphal production is quoted in it. We know from Didymus of Alexandria and Jerome, that this fact was an early stumbling-block in the way of its reception. Whether it was the sole cause, cannot be discovered.

The book of Enoch was written long before the time of Jude, so that he could easily quote it. That part of it at least from which the citation is taken, is prior to the Christian era, as has been shown by Dillmann[1] and others. Hofmann is incorrect in assigning it to a Jewish-christian of the second century;[2] and Volkmar still more so, in advancing a series of new but fallacious arguments, to show that it was composed by one of the fanatical disciples of R. Akiba in the Bar-Cochba time, i.e. A.D. 132.[3]

But did Jude really quote the book? Cave, Simon, and others answer in the negative, supposing that he

[1] Das Buch Henoch, Allgemeine Einleit. p. 43, &c.

[2] Zeitschrift der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 1852, p. 87, &c.

[3] Ibid. for 1860, p. 98, *et seq.*

only cited a traditional prophecy or saying of Enoch, subsequently incorporated in the apocryphal work. The foundation of this opinion is erroneous, because the prophecy already existed in writing. And to appeal to the language 'Enoch prophesied, *saying*,' is nugatory, since the apostle Paul introduces quotations from the Old Testament by 'Esaias *saith*,' 'David *saith*.' It is most probable that he quoted from a book, not from oral tradition. In doing so, it need not be inferred that he stamps it with authority. The apostle Paul cites several heathen poets; who supposes that he renders their productions of greater intrinsic value than they really are? His sanction extends no farther than the place he alludes to. Besides, an apocryphal work like Enoch's may have contained some correct statements. It is also thought that Jude quotes an apocryphal book in the ninth verse, when he speaks of a dispute between Michael the archangel and the devil about the body of Moses. In Origen's opinion, a Greek book called the *Ascension of Moses*, was the source of the quotation. Lardner and others suppose the reference to be to Zechariah (iii. 1, &c.); but the cases are not identical, because there is nothing in the prophet about Moses's body or Michael or a dispute about the body. The resistance of Satan to the angel refers to Joshua's consecration. Besides, it is the Lord not an angel who rebukes Satan. Jude refers to a Jewish tradition founded on Deut. xxxiv. 6, and subsequently amplified. God left the burial of Moses to Michael, but Satan withstood it, accusing Moses of being a murderer, and declaring him undeserving of honourable interment. Such is Jonathan's paraphrastic addition to Deut. xxxiv. 6. Other Christian writers adopted Jewish stories, including Paul himself, who speaks of angels taking part in the promulgation of the law (Gal. iii. 19); and of the water from the rock following the Israelites through the wilderness (1 Cor. x. 4).

Secondly. There is a similarity between the doxology and Rom. xvi. 25, betraying the use of the latter by the writer of the former. The likeness may be accounted for otherwise. And if Jude did borrow a few words from the epistle of another, he did nothing unworthy of his position or character.

Thirdly. The manner of writing, though hard, betrays familiarity with the Greek language. We do not consider this fact as fairly adverse to the Jude authorship, unless it could be shown that the writer was never out of Palestine, or that he had not been brought into contact with Greek-speaking people there, so as to learn from them how to express himself in Greek. In fact, we know too little of Jude to predicate ignorance of Greek on his part.

Had one written the epistle in Jude's name, it is likely he would have called himself an apostle. The obscurity of some parts, the difficulty if not impossibility of understanding certain allusions, and the unusual subjects introduced, combine to favour the authenticity.

TIME AND PLACE OF WRITING.

The letter itself throws little light on its date. Some put it before the destruction of Jerusalem, chiefly because that catastrophe is not mentioned in verses 5–7. But the argument drawn from silence is a fallacious one; and therefore De Wette is right in saying, that the fact of Jerusalem's destruction being unmentioned, has no bearing on the determination of the date. Others date it after the fall of the metropolis, which is the most probable view. We learn from Hegesippus, that Jude the Lord's brother was dead in the time of Domitian; and that Simeon son of Cleophas, bishop of Jerusalem, suffered martyrdom under Trajan. Hence Credner infers that the letter was written about A.D. 80. As the author separates himself not merely from the

apostles but from their age, in the seventeenth verse, because he says that mockers, foretold by the apostles as about to come in the last time, had already appeared, we must assume a comparatively late time, after all the apostles were dead except John. That of A.D. 80 is the most likely, succeeding the book of Enoch, and preceding Peter's second epistle by a considerable interval.

The place of its composition is uncertain. Perhaps it was Palestine.

PERSONS TO WHOM IT WAS ADDRESSED; OCCASION AND OBJECT.

Jude calls those to whom he writes, 'sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Jesus Christ, and called,' which means Christians in general. But he must have thought of a definite circle of readers, probably Jewish-christians; because Jewish ideas, if not books, are referred to—traditional notions belonging to Jewish soil.

It is impossible to discover their place of abode. If, as it would seem, prosperity and luxury prevailed among them; if riches and attendant vices had an injurious influence on their character, some commercial place is probable, such as Corinth. Syria is more likely, in consequence of Jude's home in Palestine. Mayerhoff advocates Alexandria on insufficient grounds.

The occasion and object of the epistle are clear. Jude, observing phenomena within the sphere of Christianity inconsistent with apostolic purity, thought it necessary to write to the believers among whom such things existed, warning them against the evil professors to whose influence they were exposed, to prevent them from corruption, and to announce the punishment that should certainly overtake the deceivers. The object for which he wrote is stated in the third verse: 'It was needful for me to write unto you, and exhort you that ye should

earnestly contend for the faith which was once delivered unto the saints.' As they were in danger of being seduced from that faith, they are exhorted to hold it fast, and to contend for it.

The description of the men who had crept in among the readers, is most unfavourable. They were ungodly, turning the grace of God into lasciviousness, denying the only Lord God and the Lord Jesus Christ, filthy dreamers, despising angelic dignities, murmurers, complainers, &c. The picture is dark, pointing to libertines or practical unbelievers who mocked at sacred things, and threatened to introduce disorder into the churches by their luxury and wantonness, as well as their opposition to existing institutions and partiality for particular persons. They wallowed in licentiousness. It does not appear that they were false teachers, for the passages which Dorner and others appeal to in favour of that opinion (verses 4, 8, 15) do not support it; the only way in which they taught error, was by a practical departure from the truth, which necessarily led to irreverent and rash assertions. Neither can the adversaries be identified with Gnostics or other heretics within the pale of Christianity. Gnosticism proper did not exist in the first century; and Thiersch's assertions about 'Christian Gnosticism' in the apostolic period, though adopted by Schott, are groundless. Rather were they immoral men, against whom the author earnestly warns his readers. It is certainly strange that Christian churches should have been in danger of seduction from such persons; but the latter may have been partially cloaked. It should also be remembered, that Christianity did not penetrate deeply into the minds of many, whose old Judaism or heathenism was apt to cling to them. Human nature in its highest state is not so perfect as to supersede the necessity of solemn warnings, or nullify the corrupting influence of voluptuous men.

CONTENTS.

The epistle consists of two parts, to which are prefixed an inscription, a salutation, and a short introduction. The first consists of verses 5–19; the second, of 20–23.

After the inscription and salutation in the first two verses, the writer introduces his subject in the third and fourth, telling his readers that he felt it necessary to address them, because certain men had crept in among them, who were described beforehand as doomed to condemnation, godless men, who abused the grace of God and denied their only Master, and Jesus Christ (1–4). In relation to these dangerous persons, he instances examples of punishment analogous to that prepared for them, and proceeds to describe their vices. They rejected angelic government, and reviled angelic dignities. How improperly they acted is proved by the case of Michael the archangel, who, disputing with Satan about Moses's body, ventured to say no more than, 'The Lord rebuke thee.' In contrast with Michael's conduct, these persons blasphemed angelic existences of whom they were ignorant, while they indulged in sensual gratifications immoderately. The author then threatens them with punishment, according to other examples of divine vengeance in the Old Testament, Cain, Balaam, and Korah. They were rocks in the love-feasts of Christians, on which good morals were shipwrecked, because they feasted together fearlessly, taking care of themselves, and neglecting the poorer brethren. They are compared to waterless clouds, autumnal trees stripped of their fruits, twice dead, rooted up; wild waves of the sea, foaming out shameful lusts; comets. After quoting Enoch's prophecy respecting them, the description is continued. They are murmurers, discontented with their lot, walking after their own lusts, talking in extravagant strains,

fawning upon others for selfish purposes. The apostles prophesied of them as mockers to come in the latter days. The last traits by which they are characterised are the desire to create divisions and parties, and their want of the Holy Spirit (5–19).

Jude addresses an admonition to his readers, that they should be established in the holy doctrines of Christianity, that they ought to pray in the Spirit and keep themselves in the love of God, while waiting for his mercy unto eternal life. He also instructs them how they should act towards the persons led away by the parties described. Some they should treat gently, i.e. the doubting and hesitating; others they should pluck out of the fire, hating everything by which they might be corrupted (20–23). The epistle concludes with a doxology (24, 25).

The diction is round and full, not neat or easy, but rather harsh. It shows one acquainted with Greek, yet unable to express his ideas in it with ease.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries on the epistle are by De Wette, 1865; Huther, 1860; Frommüller, 1859; Schott, 1862; and Stier, 1850.

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS ON THE GOSPELS.

MUTUAL RELATION.

THOSE who compare the first three gospels cannot fail to perceive that they agree not only in the substance of what they relate, but often in the diction itself. Amid minor diversities they harmonise with one another in general tenor. Hence numerous investigations have been undertaken to explain the resemblances.

The following hypotheses have been proposed to account for them.

1. That the gospels were derived from a common written source or sources.

2. That they were derived from oral tradition which had assumed a fixed form.

3. That earlier gospels were used in the composition of the later ones.

4. Some have combined the last two opinions, making a composite view out of them.

It would be a waste of time at the present day, to discuss these opinions at length. We can only indicate what appears to be settled among the best critics.

The first view has passed away, notwithstanding the amount of ingenuity expended in developing it, by Eichhorn[1] and Marsh. It is clumsy, laboured, and inadequate.

The second has also become obsolete, in spite of Gieseler's able explanation.[2] It will account for many

[1] Einleitung in das neue Testament, vol. i.

[2] Historisch-kritischer Versuch über die Entstehung und die frühesten Schicksale der schriftlichen Evangelien, 1818.

resemblances and discordances in the gospels; but it fails to explain their numerous verbal coincidences. The fixed form which it requires for the oral gospel must involve peculiar verbal agreements which would not be stereotyped. It does not meet the case, to say that the Jews preserved the sayings of their great teachers with strict accuracy; for the circle of hearers in which the oral gospel is supposed to have been formed was wider, more miscellaneous, less intellectual than the class that treasured up the sayings of the Jewish rabbis, not to speak of the manifoldness of the sayings of Jesus compared with the more easily retained and concise dicta of the former. Besides, the Jews did not rely on memory alone, but wrote down even in that age what they valued most.

The third hypothesis is the only tenable one, provided it be held intelligently, and not limited to the fact that a later evangelist used gospels only, but that he employed them with other written sources, not excluding oral tradition. The writers had various documents at their disposal, which they used in composing their own works.

Those who believe in the original independence of the evangelists—that each wrote without seeing what his predecessor had composed—have been fairly driven out of the field of criticism. One valid argument overthrows their belief, viz. the peculiar resemblance of Mark's gospel to that of Matthew. It is easy to allege that on the ground of one evangelist following another, no good reason can be given why each has here and there something peculiar to himself; why he occasionally speaks more definitely than another, more circumstantially, more chronologically, and sometimes more briefly. It is also easy to assert, that no good reason can be given why the diction of one should be altered by his successor for the worse, or changed without improvement, or rendered obscurer, or converted into worse

Greek. Difficulties innumerable may be raised with respect to the abridging, curtailing, omitting, and adding processes of a later evangelist. Why did he act so and so, and not in a certain way suggested? We answer, the writers were not servile copyists. They made free use of the gospels already composed, binding themselves neither to matter nor manner. They had also various documents now lost, some of them preserved only in fragments, others entirely unknown except in name. As long as the opponents of the hypothesis we adopt are ignorant of all the sources employed by the evangelists, the various motives actuating them, and the peculiar circumstances amid which they wrote, they cannot reasonably urge the difficulties supposed to militate against it.

The real contradictions in the gospels are confidently adduced to show the impossibility of one evangelist having had the account of another before him, because the later would have avoided them. It is taken for granted, that a writer seeing an insuperable difficulty in the record of a predecessor, would have carefully obviated it. This is an assumption resting on a certain theory of inspiration. The evangelists were not historians. They were writers of memoirs or fragmentary notices of the chief events in the life of Jesus. They meant to put together memoranda connected with his person and doings on earth; which they did according to their respective objects and predilections. The materials were more abundant than they could properly use. Gospels were not uncommon, possessing greater or less value in proportion to the matter they contained. A later evangelist never thought of an earlier one being infallibly correct; any more than he supposed himself to be infallible. Using the records of his predecessors, he followed his own method, which was not a critic's but a collector's; not the habit of a literary man, but of one unaccustomed to commit events to writing, of one

unconcerned about faults or defects. What *we* think important, as marring consistency and creating difficulty, was unimportant to them. The little value they attached to our present perplexities in the gospels, made them indifferent to their avoidance or elucidation.

The question can be brought to a probable issue in one way only; that is, by carefully examining and comparing the gospels as we have them. What do the phenomena themselves suggest? Is the similarity in all cases of a nature to exclude the partial dependence of one writer on another; or does it imply such dependence? Notwithstanding discrepancies in matter and manner which intersect resemblances—diversities interlacing the agreements in every possible variety—the evidence is still sufficient to show that the authors did not write independently of one another.

We rely on the coincidences of Mark and Matthew alone to prove the fact that the former used the latter.

It is less certain whether Mark employed Matthew and Luke; or Luke Matthew and Mark. It seems pretty clear that one or other was the case. The priority of Luke to Mark is the more probable; and therefore Mark used the gospels of his two predecessors. To reconcile contradictions and diversities with the view now taken is not difficult, if the individuality of the writers be allowed fair scope by the side of varying documents and oral tradition.

The canonical gospels were composed out of written materials chiefly. Earlier documents, which afterwards disappeared, preceded and contributed to each. This applies not only to the first but to the second and third. Oral tradition must not be excluded; but it formed a small element in the composition of each, because it had been mainly incorporated into written collections of the evangelical history when the canonical gospels appeared.

It is satisfactory to perceive that Harmonies, Greek

and English, have ceased to be regarded by good critics. Whatever use such works may have had once, their utility has passed away. Laboured attempts to put every part of the gospels into its right chronological place by transpositions, assumptions, violent distortions, so as to make a consistent and successive narrative out of the four, are justly reprehensible. It is painful to see the efforts of their authors to remove contradictions, and to explain portions in a conciliatory spirit, that are really intractable. While credit is due to Greswell and Robinson, the two ablest harmonists, for their attempts to construct works of this nature, their failure is apparent. A certain theory of inspiration underlies the process. As long as *plenary* inspiration is attributed to the evangelists, it is the interest of its advocates to find a pervading unity in the four gospels—an unity inconsistent with positive or real discrepancies. Those therefore who decry harmonies while advocating plenary inspiration, are inconsistent. Though they see that harmonists fail in many places, they do not help them to work out what is in the interest of their own belief. Their duty is to aid harmonising essays to the utmost, and not to take refuge in ignorance of all the circumstances of the case. It is timid policy to say, when a real contradiction stares the interpreter in the face, 'This could be satisfactorily cleared up, did we know all the circumstances.' What is it but saying in effect, 'I have a shorter way of getting out of the difficulties than the harmonists? I admit their present inexplicability, but hold that they are perfectly explicable if more light were thrown upon the circumstances, because the true theory of inspiration excludes the contradiction of Scripture with itself. Perhaps also the text is corrupt; it should be altered, even though authority is in its favour.'

The true corrective against harmonies is an honest explanation of the gospels as they are, or as the best

textual criticism presents them. By the process of fair exegesis, ingenious hypotheses of 'plenary' or 'dynamical' inspiration—an inspiration combining the two elements of the human and divine, the letter and the spirit, in perfection—are at once perceived to be the inventions of apologists constructing imaginary castles without regard to the character of the materials. The castles are built first; and the stones are afterwards shaped with great labour, or with a capricious readiness that forces them into unsuitable positions. The four copies of the title on the cross are sufficient to overthrow these flimsy fabrics.

The harmony subsisting between the first three gospels in matter and manner may be seen in the following sections and passages.

1.	Mat. iii. 1–12.	Mark i. 2–8.	Luke iii. 1–18.
2.	„ iii. 13–17.	„ i. 9–11.	„ iii. 21, 22.
3.	„ iv. 1–11.	„ i. 12, 13.	„ iv. 1–13.
4.	„ iv. 12–17.	„ i. 14, 15.	„ iv. 14, 15.
5.	„ iv. 18–22.	„ i. 16–20.	„ v. 1–11.
6.	„ v. 15.	„ iv. 21.	„ viii. 16, & xi. 33.
7.	„ viii. 2–4.	„ i. 40–45.	„ v. 12–16.
8.	„ viii. 14–17.	„ i. 29–34.	„ iv. 38–41.
9.	„ viii. 23–27.	„ iv. 36–41.	„ viii. 22–25.
10.	„ viii. 28–34.	„ v. 1–20.	„ viii. 26–39.
11.	„ ix. 1–8.	„ ii. 1–12.	„ v. 17–26.
12.	„ ix. 9.	„ ii. 13, 14.	„ v. 27, 28.
13.	„ ix. 10–17.	„ ii. 15–22.	„ v. 29–39.
14.	„ ix. 18–26.	„ v. 22–43.	„ viii. 41–56.
15.	„ x. 1.	„ vi. 7.	„ ix. 1.
16.	„ x. 2–4.	„ iii. 16–19.	„ vi. 13–16.
17.	„ x. 5–14.	„ vi. 8–11.	„ ix. 2–5.
18.	„ xii. 1–8.	„ ii. 23–28.	„ vi. 1–5.
19.	„ xii 9–14.	„ iii. 1–6.	„ vi. 6–11.
20.	„ xii. 22–30.	„ iii. 22–27.	„ xi. 14–23.
21.	„ xii. 46–50.	„ iii. 31–35.	„ viii. 19–21.
22.	„ xiii. 1–23.	„ iv. 1–25.	„ viii. 4–15.
23.	„ xiv. 1, 2.	„ vi. 14, 15.	„ ix. 7, 8.
24.	„ xiv. 3, 4.	„ vi. 17, 18.	„ iii. 19, 20.
25.	„ xiv. 13–21.	„ vi. 30–44.	„ ix. 10–17.
26.	„ xvi. 13–28.	„ viii. 27–ix. 1.	„ ix. 18–27.
27.	„ xvii. 1–8.	„ ix. 2–8.	„ ix. 28–36.
28.	„ xvii. 14–18.	„ ix. 14–27.	„ ix. 37–43
29.	„ xvii. 22, 23.	„ ix. 30–32.	„ ix. 43–45.

30.	Mat. xviii. 1–5.	Mark ix. 33–41.	Luke ix. 46–50.
31.	„ xix. 13–15.	„ x. 13–16.	„ xviii. 15–17.
32.	„ xix. 16–30.	„ x. 17–31.	„ xviii. 18–30.
33.	„ xx. 17–19.	„ x. 32–34.	„ xviii. 31–34.
34.	„ xx. 29–34.	„ x. 46–52.	„ xviii. 35–43.
35.	„ xxi. 1–9.	„ xi. 1–10.	„ xix. 29–38.
36.	„ xxi. 12, 13.	„ xi. 15–17.	„ xix. 45, 46.
37.	„ xxi. 23–27.	„ xi. 27–33.	„ xx. 1–8.
38.	„ xxi. 33–46.	„ xii. 1–12.	„ xx. 9–19.
39.	„ xxii. 15–22.	„ xii. 13–17.	„ xx. 20–26.
40.	„ xxii. 23–33.	„ xii. 18–27.	„ xx. 27–40.
41.	„ xxii. 41–46.	„ xii. 35–37.	„ xx. 41–44.
42.	„ xxiii. 1–14.	„ xii. 38–40.	„ xx. 45–47.
43.	„ xxiv. 1–36.	„ xiii. 1–32.	„ xxi. 5–33.
44.	„ xxvi. 1–5.	„ xiv. 1, 2.	„ xxii. 1, 2.
45.	„ xxvi. 14–16.	„ xiv. 10, 11.	„ xxii. 3–6.
46.	„ xxvi. 17–29.	„ xiv. 12–25.	„ xxii. 7–23.
47.	„ xxvi. 36–56.	„ xiv. 32–52.	„ xxii. 40–53.
48.	„ xxvi. 57, 58.	„ xiv. 53, 54.	„ xxii. 54, 55.
49.	„ xxvi. 69–75.	„ xiv. 66–72.	„ xxii. 56–71.
50.	„ xxvii. 1, 2.	„ xv. 1.	„ xxiii. 1.
51.	„ xxvii. 11–23.	„ xv. 2–14.	„ xxiii. 2–23.
52.	„ xxvii. 26.	„ xv. 15.	„ xxiii. 24, 25.
53.	„ xxvii. 32.	„ xv. 21.	„ xxiii. 26.
54.	„ xxvii. 33.	„ xv. 22.	„ xxiii. 33.
55.	„ xxvii. 34–38.	„ xv. 24–28.	„ xxiii. 33, 34, 38.
56.	„ xxvii. 39–56.	„ xv. 29–41.	„ xxiii. 35–49.
57.	„ xxvii. 57–61.	„ xv. 42–47.	„ xxiii. 50–56.
58.	„ xxviii. 1–8.	„ xvi. 1–8.	„ xxiv. 1–9.

The parallels now given from the three gospels will not appear the same in different lists, in consequence of the different views entertained of the principles that should underlie a harmony, and diversities of judgment as to the mode of carrying out those principles. Hence the tables furnished by critics differ.

Again, while the matter constituting the body of the three gospels is similar, there is great diversity in its arrangement. Chronological sequence cannot be perceived in any one of the writers. Matthew comes nearest it. In the arrangement of facts, Mark agrees more nearly with Luke than Matthew; so that he is farther from the true order.

There are sections common to two only, of which the following are all the cases possible.

(*a*). Sections and places common to Matthew and Mark:—

1.	Matthew.—x. 42.	Mark.—ix. 41.
2.	„ xiii. 34, 35.	„ iv. 33, 34.
3.	„ xiii. 54–58.	„ vi. 2–6.
4.	„ xiv. 6–12.	„ vi. 21–29.
5.	„ xiv. 22, 23.	„ vi. 45, 46.
6.	„ xiv. 28–36.	„ vi. 50–56.
7.	„ xv. 1–20.	„ vii. 1–23.
8.	„ xv. 21–29.	„ vii. 24–31.
9.	„ xv. 30–39.	„ viii. 1–10.
10.	„ xvi. 1–4.	„ viii. 11–13.
11.	„ xvi. 5–12.	„ viii. 14–21.
12.	„ xvii. 9–13.	„ ix. 9–13.
13.	„ xvii. 19–21.	„ ix. 28, 29.
14.	„ xviii. 6–9.	„ ix. 42–48.
15.	„ xix. 1–9.	„ x. 1–12.
16.	„ xx. 20–28.	„ x. 35–45.
17.	„ xxi. 17–22.	„ xi. 11–14, 19–26.
18.	„ xxii. 34–40.	„ xii. 28–34.
19.	„ xxiv. 22–26.	„ xiii. 20–23.
20.	„ xxvi. 6–13.	„ xiv. 3–9.
21.	„ xxvi. 42–46, 48.	„ xiv. 39–42, 44.
22.	„ xxvi. 59–68.	„ xiv. 55–65.
23.	„ xxvii. 15–18.	„ xv. 6–10.
24.	„ xxvii. 27–31.	„ xv. 16–20.
25.	„ xxvii. 46–49.	„ xv. 34–36.
26.	„ xxviii. 7.	„ xvi. 7.

(*b*). Passages found in Mark and Luke only:—

1.	Mark.—i. 21–88.	Luke.—iv. 31–37.
2.	„ i. 35–39.	„ iv. 42–44.
3.	„ i. 45.	„ v. 15, 16.
4.	„ ii. 4.	„ v. 19.
5.	„ iii. 13–15.	„ vi. 12, 13.
6.	„ iv. 21–25.	„ viii. 16–18.
7.	„ v. 4.	„ viii. 27.
8.	„ v. 9, 10.	„ viii. 30, 31.
9.	„ v. 29–33.	„ viii. 45–47.
10.	„ v. 35–37.	„ viii. 48–51.
11.	„ vi. 15, 16.	„ ix. 8, 9.
12.	„ vi. 30, 31.	„ ix. 10.
13.	„ viii. 38.	„ ix. 26.
14.	„ ix. 38–40.	„ ix. 49, 50.
15.	„ xi. 18.	„ xix. 47, 48.
16.	„ xii. 41–44.	„ xxi. 1–4.
17.	„ xiii. 9, 11.	„ xxi. 12–15.

(*c*). Parallel passages found in Matthew and Luke only:—

1.	Matthew.—iv. 3–11.	Luke.—iv. 3–13.
2.	,, v. 1–12.	,, vi. 20–23.
3.	,, v. 39–48.	,, vi. 27–36.
4.	,, v. 18.	,, xvi. 17.
5.	,, v. 25, 26.	,, xii. 58, 59.
6.	,, vi. 7–13.	,, xi. 1–4.
7.	,, vi. 19–21.	,, xii. 33, 34.
8.	,, vi. 22, 23.	,, xi. 34–36.
9.	,, vi. 24.	,, xvi. 13.
10.	,, vi. 25–33.	,, xii. 22–31.
11.	,, vii. 1, 2, 3–5, 12, [16–20, 24–27.	,, vi. 31, 37, 38, 41, 42, [44–49.
12.	,, viii. 5–13.	,, vii. 1–10.
13.	,, viii. 19–22.	,, ix. 57–60.
14.	,, ix. 37, 38.	,, x. 2.
15.	,, x. 12, 13.	,, x. 5, 6.
16.	,, x. 15.	,, x. 12.
17.	,, x. 16.	,, x. 3.
18.	,, x. 19, 20.	,, xii. 11, 12.
19.	,, x. 24.	,, vi. 40.
20.	,, x. 26–33.	,, xii. 2–9.
21.	,, x. 34, 35.	,, xii. 51–53.
22.	,, xi. 2–19.	,, vii. 18–35.
23.	,, xi. 21–23.	,, x. 13–15.
24.	,, xi. 25–27.	,, x. 21, 22.
25.	,, xii. 23.	,, xi. 14.
26.	,, xii. 38–42.	,, xi. 16, 29–31.
27.	,, xii. 43–45.	,, xi. 24–26.
28.	,, xiii. 33.	,, xiii. 20, 21.
29.	,, xviii. 12–14.	,, xv. 4–7.
30.	,, xxiii. 37–39.	,, xiii. 34, 35.
31.	,, xxiv. 45–51.	,, xii. 42–48.
32.	,, xxv. 14–30.	,, xix. 11–28.

For *verbal correspondences* in three gospels, the following passages, selected from those just given, may serve:—

Matt.—iii. 3.	Mark.—i. 3.	Luke.—iii. 4.
,, iii. 11.	,, i. 7.	,, iii. 16.
,, viii. 2–4.	,, i. 40–44.	,, v. 12–14.
,, viii. 15.	,, i. 31.	,, iv. 39.
,, ix. 2, 4–6.	,, ii. 5, 8–10.	,, v. 20, 22–24.
,, ix. 15.	,, ii. 20.	,, v. 35.
,, ix. 22.	,, v. 34.	,, viii. 48.
,, ix. 24.	,, v. 39.	,, viii. 52.
,, xii. 13.	,, iii. 5.	,, vi. 10.

Matt.—xiv. 19, 20.	Mark.—vi. 41–43.	Luke.—ix. 16, 17.
„ xvi. 21.	„ vii. 31.	„ ix. 22.
„ xvi. 24–26.	„ viii. 34–37.	„ ix. 23–25.
„ xvi. 28.	„ ix. 1.	„ ix. 27.
„ xvii. 5.	„ ix. 7.	„ ix. 35.
„ xvii. 17.	„ ix. 19.	„ ix. 41.
„ xix. 29.	„ x. 29.	„ xviii. 29.
„ xxi. 12, 13.	„ xi. 15, 17.	„ xix. 45, 46.
„ xxi. 23.	„ xi. 28.	„ xx. 2.
„ xxi. 25–27.	„ xi. 30–33.	„ xx. 4, 5, 6, 8.
„ xxi. 42.	„ xii. 10.	„ xx. 17.
„ xxii. 44.	„ xii. 36.	„ xx. 42, 43.
„ xxiv. 6–9.	„ xiii. 7–13.	„ xxi. 9–17.
„ xxiv. 19.	„ xiii. 17.	„ xxi. 23.
„ xxiv. 30.	„ xiii. 26.	„ xxi. 27.
„ xxiv. 35.	„ xiii. 31.	„ xxi. 33.
„ xxvi. 29.	„ xiv. 25.	„ xxii. 18.

Other verbal coincidences in the parallel sections and passages of the three gospels may be discovered besides the present. There are some very striking examples in such coincident passages, of verbal agreement between two of the evangelists, the third relating the same things in different words. None of these, however, has been adduced, because our object is to select verbal coincidences between the three writers *in sections or passages common to all.* The verbal coincidences between two gospels alone are more frequent and striking. Take the following specimens in sections or passages common to two evangelists:—

Matthew.—xiv. 22, 34.	Mark.—vi. 45, 53.
„ xv. 7–10.	„ vii. 6, 7, 14.
„ xv. 26, 32.	„ vii. 27; viii. 1, 2.
„ xix. 5, 6.	„ x. 7–9.
„ xx. 22–28.	„ x. 38–45.
„ xxiv. 22.	„ xiii. 20.
Mark. — i. 24, 25.	Luke.—iv. 34, 35.
„ viii. 38.	„ ix. 26.
„ ix. 38, 40.	„ ix. 49, 50.
Matthew.—v. 44.	Luke.—vi. 27, 28.
„ vii. 5.	„ vi. 42.
„ viii. 8–10.	„ vii. 6–9.
„ viii. 20, 22.	„ ix. 58, 60.
„ xi. 3–11.	„ vii. 19–28.

Matthew.—	xi. 16–19.	Luke.—	vii. 31–35.
„	xii. 41–45.	„	xi. 24–26, 31, 32.
„	xiii. 33.	„	xiii. 20, 21.
„	xxiii. 37, 38.	„	xiii. 34, 35.
„	xxiv. 46–50.	„	xii. 43–46.

Bishop Marsh pointed out the following phenomena connected with the verbal agreement of the gospels.

1. The examples in which all three gospels verbally coincide are not very numerous; and contain, in general, only one or two, or at most three sentences together.

2. The examples of verbal agreement between Matthew and Mark are very numerous.

3. The examples of verbal agreement between Mark and Luke are not numerous, being but eight in all.[1]

4. It escaped the notice of Marsh that the verbal coincidences are more numerous in reciting the words of Jesus, and in the reports of words spoken by others in connection with his language, than in the narrative parts. Where the evangelists speak in their own person, such verbal agreement can scarcely be termed rare, as it is by Norton. It appears, at least, to such an extent in the narrative parts of Mark as to show that the mind of the evangelist, imbued with the sentiments and language of Matthew, led him into his predecessor's ideas and expressions naturally.

If the synoptic text be divided into 124 sections, as it is by Reuss, forty-seven of them are common to the three. Twelve are in Matthew and Mark, two in Matthew and Luke, six in Mark and Luke. Seventeen are in Matthew alone, two in Mark, and thirty-eight in Luke alone.

5. It should also be observed, that the portions of the gospels in which the words of others are repeated, bear a small proportion to the narrative parts. If, for example, the gospels be separated into two divisions, the one consisting of the recital of others' words, the second

[1] Marsh's Michaëlis, vol. iii. p. 378, &c.

of the evangelists' statements of facts; the extent of the latter will be much greater than that of the former. Mr. Norton, who has carefully examined this subject, finds the proportion of verbal coincidence in the narrative part of Matthew, compared with what exists in the other part, to be as one to more than two; in Mark, as one to four; and in Luke as one to ten.[1]

6. Verbal coincidences are also found in predictions from the Old Testament, though much seldomer than in the case just mentioned. This may be owing to the common use of the Septuagint version.

As long as every part of the gospels is considered to be historical, no advance can be made toward ascertaining their genetic origin or true characteristics. If they be assigned to the writers whose names they bear, internal evidence disproves it; for it is plain that unhistorical materials are incorporated, the gradual growth of more than one generation after the apostles and their companions. When also it is affirmed by Norton, that 'the Christians of the first two centuries had as great reverence for the sacred books of our religion as Christians of the present day,' the statement is unfounded. Certain it is, that Papias did not look upon them as canonical or authoritative, for he says, 'I did not think that things out of books profited me as much as those of the living and abiding voice,'[2] implying that he set as high a value on oral tradition in regard to the evangelical history as he did upon the gospels with which he was acquainted, if not a higher one. So too Hegesippus (A.D. 170) places the orthodoxy of the Church in its attachment to the law, the prophets, and the Lord, without allusion to a standard of apostolic writings.[3] It is also incorrect to assert, that Justin regarded the gospels as entitled to equal reverence with

[1] The Evidences of the Genuineness of the Gospels, vol. i. p. cii.; additional notes.

[2] Ap. Euseb. H. E. iii. 39.

[3] Ibid. iv. 22.

the Jewish Scriptures. In quoting from the writings of apostles he never uses the phrases common in relation to the Old Testament, 'the Spirit says,' 'God speaks through them.' It was not till towards the close of the second century, that the catholic Christians began to feel the necessity of elevating the four gospels which had attained general currency, to the dignity and authority of canonicity, and so attributing to them a value already accorded to the Old Testament. Before A.D. 160 there is no proof, but rather the reverse, that Christians generally had great reverence for the first three gospels, or for the similar productions by which they were preceded and by whose aid they were written. But we shall discuss this subject in a future chapter.

The narratives consist of the real and the ideal—the historical and mythic, with a preponderance of the former as basis. No critic will deny that the time between the occurrences and the present gospels was sufficient to allow of the growth of legends and the moulding power of fancy in connection with the original facts; whence they are presented in forms more or less distorted, exaggerated, unreal—or buried beneath later creations. A mythic haze encompasses the person, life, and discourses of Jesus, which may be often penetrated, often not. Sober criticism must set about the task of removing it reverently not rashly, respecting tradition without superstitiously adopting it. After this has been done, there will still stand forth in colours more or less distinct, a person such as the world never saw before—the living type of an ideal humanity, pure and perfect—destined to influence all times, to purify all people among whom his name is pronounced, and to ennoble his followers by lifting them up to the measure of the stature of his fulness.

Tradition is the mother of fable. By admitting a traditional source of the gospel wholly or in part, a concession is made to its historical inaccuracy. If

indeed the evangelic tradition existed alone only during the life of its authors, if it was fixed in writing before the first witnesses passed away, no period is left for mythic embellishment. But that position is critically untenable. External evidence does not prove it: internal is adverse. Between the earliest witnesses and the fixing of the tradition in writing, sufficient time elapsed for the mythical element to be developed. Had we even the memoirs which Mark wrote down from Peter, or Matthew's Aramaic oracles, it is probable that the moulding influence of oral tradition would appear; how much more in the present synoptists, which are the growth of successive recensions, the embodiment of varying traditions Galilean and Judaic, apostolic and post-apostolic?

THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW.

ALLEGED WRITER.

MATTHEW and Levi may have been different persons. We think it more probable, however, that they were the same. The circumstances related by Mark and Luke respecting the call of Levi are so like those connected with the call of Matthew, that identity of person may be reasonably assumed. Perhaps after embracing Christianity and changing his mode of life, the apostle adopted a new name. Matthew, the son of Alphaeus, a native of Galilee, was summoned from his employment of publican at Capernaum to be a disciple of Jesus. Few particulars of his life are recorded. It is said that he left Palestine to preach the gospel in other countries, in Arabia Felix for example, part of which was called Ethiopia, and where there were many Jews. His ascetic manner of life noticed by Clement of Alexandria, rests on an apocryphal foundation; and the accounts of his death are uncertain. According to Heracleon he died a natural death, but whether in Ethiopia, as Socrates affirms, or in Macedonia, according to Isidore of Seville, it is impossible to ascertain. The statement of Nicephorus that he suffered martyrdom, is less probable.

THE PERSONS FOR WHOM THE GOSPEL WAS INTENDED.

It was universally believed in ancient times, that the first gospel was intended for the use of Jewish-christians. The fact is affirmed by Irenaeus, Eusebius,

Jerome, and others; and internal evidence favours it. The writer presupposes an acquaintance on the part of his readers with Judea, its geography, natural productions, and local phenomena, which could only have been expected of Jews. They had the temple before their eyes, with its sacrificial arrangements. They were familiar with the customs of the Hebrews, and are supposed to know the Mosaic law. The entire contents of the gospel, especially its citations from the Old Testament with their introductory formulas, attest the truth of our statement. Thus the evangelist writes that the institutions of the law and the prophetic writings were significant of things future till John appeared, with whom their fulfilment began (xi. 13–15).

THE ORIGINAL LANGUAGE IN WHICH MATTHEW WROTE.

Ancient testimony is unanimous in declaring that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, i.e. Aramaean or Syro-Chaldaic, the vernacular tongue of the Jews in Palestine at the time of Christ and his disciples.

Papias, a hearer of John the presbyter, stated in a work entitled 'An Exposition of Oracles of the Lord,'[1] 'Matthew composed the oracles in the Hebrew dialect, and every one interpreted them as he was able.'[2] Was Papias a credible witness? Eusebius states concerning him,[3] 'He appears to have been of very weak understanding,' an observation employed to invalidate his testimony. But this judgment rested on the fact that Papias understood certain parables of our Lord too literally; and entertained millennarian opinions, to which the historian was strongly opposed. Slender abilities are no impediment to the credibility of a witness, if he possess integrity of character. When

[1] *λογίων κυριακῶν ἐξήγησις.*

[2] *Ματθαῖος μὲν οὖν Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο, ἡρμήνευσε δ' αὐτὰ ὡς ἦν δυνατὸς ἕκαστος.*—Ap. *Euseb. H. E.* iii. 39.

[3] *σφόδρα . . . . σμικρὸς ὢν τὸν νοῦν . . . . φαίνεται.*

Eusebius says of Papias elsewhere, 'a man most eloquent in every respect and skilled in Scripture,' [1] the words are probably spurious, since they are not in the St. Petersburg Syriac copy dated A.D. 462, nor in several Greek MSS. specified by Schwegler. Papias has specified the source whence he derived his information respecting Matthew. The presbyter John was his authority, for after the historian introduces a quotation from Papias relative to Mark and his gospel, beginning with 'and the presbyter said this,' he subjoins, 'such is the account of Papias respecting Mark.' And of Matthew he has said as follows, 'Matthew composed,' &c. It is scarcely probable that Eusebius would have written, 'these things have been said of Matthew,' [2] had not the information given in the quotation from Papias immediately following been drawn from the same source with that contained in the quotation immediately preceding.

According to Schleiermacher and others, the phrase, 'the oracles,' [3] used by Papias denotes a collection of our Lord's *remarkable sayings* written in Hebrew, which were subsequently extended and explained by the addition of facts and circumstances belonging to time and place. The context of the passage in Eusebius shows this restriction of the word to the *discourses* of Christ, and the explanation of ἡρμήνευσε [4] to be incorrect. In speaknig of Mark's gospel it is said that the evangelist did not write in regular *order* [5] the things which were either spoken or done by Christ; to which it is immediately subjoined, that Peter gave Mark such instruction as was necessary, but not a connected history of our Lord's discourses. Here 'the Lord's discourses,' [6] is explained by 'the things spoken or done by Christ,' both being used synonymously of the contents of Mark's

[1] ἀνὴρ τὰ πάντα λογιώτατος καὶ τῆς γραφῆς εἰδήμων.
[2] περὶ δὲ τοῦ Ματθαίου ταῦτ' εἴρηται.
[3] τὰ λόγια.
[4] ἡρμήνευσε (explanation by enlargement).
[5] τάξει.
[6] τὰ κυριακὰ λόγια.

gospel. On the other hand, the writer, in speaking of Matthew says, 'He composed the oracles.'[1] In the New Testament, the word 'oracles'[2] also appears in a wider sense than that claimed for it by Schleiermacher (ep. to the Romans iii. 2; ep. to Hebrews v. 12); and the patristic use of it is also more general, as Suicer's examples show. We believe, therefore, that in the passage of Papias preserved by Eusebius, it means nothing else than a record of the sayings and doings of Christ. As the former predominated, the name took its origin from the principal part. But how did each one *translate*[3] the Aramaean record of Matthew? This language implies that the time was past when the Hebrew alone was current; and that the present Greek translation had superseded the necessity of individual attempts, though it had not attained to the position of canonicity in Papias's eyes. It had supplanted preceding recensions, so that it was no longer necessary to translate the Hebrew to the best of one's abilities; but Papias did not recognise it as authentic, since he had recourse to tradition for what the apostle said. The process by which one gospel was received, to the exclusion of others, was a slow and gradual one, being determined as much by time as by the intrinsic character of the last.[4]

The next witness is Irenaeus who writes: 'Matthew among the Hebrews did also publish a gospel in writing, in their own language.'[5] It has been said that Irenaeus adopted this opinion from Papias, and he may have

[1] *τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο.* The *συνεγράψατο* refers to the *σύνταξις* preceding; and *τὰ λόγια* also refers to *λόγια κυριακά.* Peter did not recite the contents of Mark's Gospel *ὥσπερ σύνταξιν τῶν κυριακῶν ποιούμενος λογίων.* Matthew, on the contrary, *Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ τὰ λόγια συνεγράψατο.*

[2] *λόγια.* [3] *ἡρμήνευσε.*

[4] The new interpretation of the *κυριακὰ λόγια* proposed by Volkmar. cannot be accepted, notwithstanding the confidence with which it is advanced. Geschichtstreuen Theologie, p. 47, and Der Ursprung unserer Evangelien, pp. 61, 134.

[5] *Ὁ μὲν δὴ Ματθαῖος ἐν τοῖς Ἑβραίοις τῇ ἰδίᾳ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καὶ γραφὴν ἐξηνέγκεν εὐαγγελίου, κ.τ.λ.—Adv. Haeres.* iii. 1.

done so. He had certainly a high respect for Papias, and followed him in holding the doctrine of the millennium. We do not know, however, whether he believed that Matthew wrote in Aramaean merely because Papias thought so.

Pantaenus is the third witness; of whom Eusebius writes: 'Pantaenus is also said to have gone to the Indians, where it is reported he found the gospel of Matthew, which had been delivered to some in that country, who had the knowledge of Christ before his arrival: to whom Bartholomew, one of the apostles, is said to have preached, and to have left with them that writing of Matthew in Hebrew letters, and that it was preserved among them to the time in question.'[1] The words of Jerome about Pantaenus are similar: 'Pantaenus found that Bartholomew, one of the twelve apostles, had preached in India the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ according to the Gospel of Matthew, which was written in Hebrew, and which also on his return to Alexandria he carried with him.'[2]

This testimony is important because it is independent of Papias. It is true that the account of Pantaenus going to India was *a tradition*, since Eusebius introduces it as such;[3] but the historian himself appears to have thought it correct. If it were a *report* that Pantaenus found the gospel of Matthew there, we are not at liberty to infer the falseness of it at once. As India means southern Arabia, the persons to whom

[1] Ὁ Πάνταινος καὶ εἰς Ἰνδοὺς ἐλθεῖν λέγεται· ἔνθα λόγος εὑρεῖν αὐτὸν προφθάσαν τὴν αὐτοῦ παρουσίαν τὸ κατὰ Ματθαῖον εὐαγγέλιον παρά τισιν αὐτόθι τὸν Χριστὸν ἐπεγνωκόσιν· οἷς Βαρθολομαῖον τῶν ἀποστόλων ἕνα κηρύξαι, αὐτοῖς τε Ἑβραίων γράμμασι τὴν τοῦ Ματθαίου καταλεῖψαι γραφήν, ἣν καὶ σώζεσθαι εἰς τὸν ἐηλούμενον χρόνον.—*H. E.* v. 10.

[2] Pantaenus . . . . ubi [in India] reperit Bartholomaeum de duodecim apostolis adventum domini nostri Jesus Christi juxta Matthaei evangelium praedicasse, quod Hebraicis literis scriptum reverteńs Alexandriam secum retulit.—*De Viris Illustr.* c. 36.

[3] λέγεται.

Bartholomew preached were Jewish-christians unacquainted with Greek. Had Bartholomew made a version from the Greek, it would have been into Arabic. We infer therefore, that he took with him the Aramaean gospel of Matthew.

Eusebius gives Origen's testimony in these words: 'The first was written by Matthew, once a publican, afterwards an apostle of Jesus Christ, who delivered it to the Jewish believers, composed in the Hebrew language.'[1] According to Harless, this opinion must be resolved into that of Irenaeus. But the most acute, and one of the most learned of the fathers, was not disposed to receive or adopt an opinion solely on Irenaeus's credit. It is true that Eusebius gives Origen's words with the introduction, 'as I have understood from tradition;' but that shows the prevalent belief of the age. The tradition which he adopted was general in his day.

Eusebius himself says: 'For Matthew having first preached to the Hebrews, when he was about to go to other people, delivered to them in their own language the gospel according to him,' &c.[2]

This testimony is valuable, and can hardly be merged in that of Papias. If the historian was an enemy to millennarianism, and had but a poor opinion of Papias's abilities, it is not probable that he would have followed him in believing Aramean to be the original language of Matthew's gospel. Had he dissented from the current belief of the age, he would not have written as he does; for while he records, he often pronounces his own opinion. Hug affirms, that Eusebius gives a different view in another place. In his commentary on Psalm lxxviii. 2, we find the words, 'Instead of this "I will

[1] Πρῶτον μὲν γέγραπται τὸ κατὰ τὸν ποτὲ τελώνην, ὕστερον δὲ ἀπόστολον Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ Ματθαῖον, ἐκδεδωκότα αὐτὸ τοῖς ἀπὸ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ πιστεῦσασι, γράμμασιν Ἑβραϊκοῖς συντεταγμένον.—*H. E.* vi. 25.

[2] Ματθαῖος μὲν γὰρ πρότερον Ἑβραίοις κηρύξας, ὡς ἔμελλε καὶ ἐφ' ἑτέρους ἰέναι, πατρίῳ γλώττῃ γραφῇ παραδοὺς τὸ κατ' αὐτὸν εὐαγγέλιον τὸ λεῖπον τῇ αὐτοῦ παρουσίᾳ, κ.τ.λ.—*H. E.* iii. 24.

utter from the beginning," Matthew being a Hebrew, has used his own recension, I will shout things hid from the foundation,'[1] &c., which Hug interprets to mean, that Matthew 'as one who was himself master of the Hebrew language, deserted the Septuagint rendering, and gave his own Greek translation,' implying that the apostle wrote in Greek. The term we have rendered *recension*[2] does indeed seem to mean *interpretation*; and therefore the writer is inconsistent with himself; but we need not expect uniform consistency in the case of the fathers. Eusebius forgot at the time the current tradition of the day and his own expressed opinion. That his real belief was given in his Ecclesiastical History, is confirmed by the fact that in another place[3] he ascribes a reading in Matt. xxviii. 1[4] to the *translator*, adding that the evangelist Matthew published the gospel in the Hebrew tongue.

According to Jerome, the authentic gospel of Matthew was written in Hebrew. 'Matthew, also called Levi, who from being a publican became an apostle, first wrote a gospel of Christ in Judea, in the Hebrew language and letters, for the benefit of those of the circumcision who believed. Who afterwards translated it into Greek is uncertain.'[5] Thus Jerome believed that Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew or Aramaean. In the same passage, he states that the Nazarenes, who had a copy of the original in Pamphilus's library at Caesarea, allowed him to make a copy of it (*describere*).

Elsewhere he relates that he translated the gospel

[1] ἀντὶ τοῦ Φθέγξομαι ἀπ' ἀρχῆς, Ἑβραῖος ὢν ὁ Ματθαῖος οἰκείᾳ ἐκδόσει κέχρηται, εἰπών. Ερεύξομαι κεκρυμμένα ἀπὸ καταβολῆς.—Vol. v. pp. 904, 905, ed. Migne.

[2] ἔκδοσις.

[3] Ad Marin. Quaest. ii. ap. Mai, Script. Vet. Nov. Coll. i. p. 64, &c.

[4] ὀψὲ τοῦ σαββάτου. The present reading is ὀψὲ δὲ σαββάτων.

[5] Matthaeus qui et Levi, ex publicano apostolus, primus in Judea propter eos qui ex circumcisione crediderant, evangelium Christi Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit. Quod quis postea in Graecum transtulerit, non satis certum est.—*De Viris Illustr.* c. 3.

according to the Hebrews, which the Nazarenes and Ebionites used, into Greek and Latin.[1]

Does Jerome identify these two documents, the Aramaean original of Matthew and the Gospel according to the Hebrews? Meyer supposes he does not, chiefly because Jerome affirms that he merely *copied* the former, and *translated* the latter. The Hebrew Matthew, he thinks, did not need *translation*, because in Jerome's time it had been already rendered both into Greek and Latin. But it is plain that the learned father did not mean to draw this distinction, because he says that both documents were in the hands of the Nazarenes. It was *they* who gave him permission to transcribe the Aramaean, and they were the people who, along with the Ebionites, used the Gospel according to the Hebrews.

But some say that though Jerome believed in the identity of the two documents at one time, he subsequently retracted the opinion, as is indicated by the use of the phrases 'which is called by most the authentic work of Matthew,' 'as most think.'[2] It has been thought that this language implies a strong suspicion in his mind, and that though he does not expressly avow a change, he does so virtually in attributing to *the many* or to *most people*, what he himself once believed. We admit that the doubtful way in which he speaks about the identity of the two is found in writings posterior to those in which that identity is implied; for the phrase 'called by most the authentic work of Matthew,'[3] is, in his commentary on Matthew, written six years later than the treatise, 'De Viris Illustribus;' and the expression, 'as most think,'[4] twenty-three years later, in his book against Pelagianism. Yet it is diffi-

[1] De Viris Illustr. c. 2.

[2] Quod vocatur a plerisque Matthaei authenticum; ut plerique autumant.

[3] *Vocatur a plerisque* Matthaei authenticum.

[4] Ut plerique autumant.

cult to suppose that a scholar like Jerome, who had translated a document into Greek and Latin, could ever be so ignorant of its nature as to confound it with another work. The expressions on which his supposed change of belief is based, may be explained on other grounds. Additions had been made to the document by the persons in whose hands it was preserved, sufficient to create a difficulty in the mind as to whether it really proceeded from an apostle. Though its contents agreed substantially with the Greek gospel, it exhibited deviations from it; changes which could not be thought other than corruptions; modifications and interpolations sometimes absurd or ridiculous, at other times apocryphal or fabulous. Besides, the sect that used it had begun to be considered heretical by the great body of catholic Christians, and Jerome was very jealous both of his fair name and unsullied orthodoxy. To his timid mind it may have appeared hazardous to identify the document peculiar to a sect with the authentic Aramaean. It would have been safer to affirm the loss of the original; yet the conviction of his mind would not allow him to do so. Had he altered his opinion, he had every reason for saying so openly; the fact that he speaks cautiously, is an indication that he did not in his heart retract a former view.

Passages from the Gospel according to the Hebrews, occur in the writings of Clement, Origen, Epiphanius, and Jerome, which do not throw satisfactory light on its original and substantial identity with the present Greek gospel.[1] There is considerable likeness on the one hand, but dissimilarity on the other. The discrepancies consist, for the most part, of additions to the text of the Greek, usually of an apocryphal character.

[1] All the existing fragments are given by Anger, in his *Synopsis Evangeliorum*, with the corresponding passages of the canonical gospels, 1851; and by Hilgenfeld, in his Zeitschrift für wissenschaftliche Theologie for 1863, p. 352, *et seq.*

The state of both, as far we know it, consists with the fact of their original identity, but only on condition, that the Gospel according to the Hebrews had been rendered into Greek ; that its text both in Aramaean and in Greek, *as we know it from patristic citations*, was of a later type than the canonical Greek—facts which do not disprove the common origin of the Aramaean and present Greek.

The fathers did not regard the Gospel according to the Hebrews as canonical, because it was almost peculiar to parties who were not Gentile Christians, because it had plain apocryphal passages, and because they had a Greek one which they received as canonical from its supposed connection with an apostle. Doubtless they thought that the Hebrew Christians had corrupted it.

The original identity of the Gospel according to the Hebrews and the Aramaean Matthew would be disproved, could it be shown that the former was written at first in Greek, and thence translated into Aramaean. But this has not been proved, though good critics, like Credner, De Wette, and Bleek have made the attempt. One argument they allege is founded on Jerome's statement, that Barabbas was interpreted in it, *son of their master*,[1] arising, as is alleged, from an error of the translator, who mistook the etymology of the Greek word Barabbas,[2] and put for it the Aramaean,[3] *son of their master*.[4] But the expression is only a witty explanation of the proper name, importing that the Jews and Barabbas had one master and father, viz. Satan.[5] Again, in speaking of John Baptist's food, it had 'wild honey, whose taste was like manna, or cakes made with honey and oil.'[6] Hence it is inferred that the author

[1] Filius magistri eorum.
[2] Βαραββᾶς.
[3] בר רבהן, instead of בר אבא
[4] Comment. in Matth. xxvii. 16.
[5] See Anger's Synopsis Evangeliorum Matthaei, Marci, Lucae, &c. p. 275.
[6] μέλι ἄγριον, οὗ ἡ γεῦσις ἦν τοῦ μάννα, ὡς ἐγκρὶς ἐν ἐλαίῳ. See Irenaeus, Haeres. xxix. 9.

of the Aramaean document used a Greek source in which he read 'cakes' by mistake for 'locusts.'[1] The introduction of the word arose from another cause. Whoever made the addition to 'wild honey,'[2] by describing it 'whose taste was like manna, or cakes made with honey and oil,' had regard to Numb. xi. 8, where it is applied to the manna; and this description was annexed in Aramaean to the Aramaean of 'wild honey.' The Greek translator of the copy which Epiphanius had, looking at the Septuagint version of Numb. xi. 8, found the words 'cake of oil'[3] and adopted them. The mistake was made by the translator of the Aramaean, and does not prove the Greek original of the Ebionite or Nazarene gospel.

The hypothesis of the Greek original of the Gospel according to the Hebrews has the statements of the fathers, of Eusebius, Epiphanius, and Jerome against it, which speak of a Hebrew original. It is also contradicted by the early opinion that the Gospel of the Hebrews was identical with the Hebrew original of Matthew.

This chain of testimonies need not be followed further. Ancient witnesses are unanimous in favour of the opinion that Matthew wrote a gospel in Hebrew. They also attest the fact of its identity with the so-called Gospel of the Nazarenes. The slightest trace of an opposite tradition does not appear. The apostle wrote in Judea; and the fathers who furnish traditional information respecting his Hebrew gospel lived for a time in that country, with the exception of Papias and Irenaeus. Origen, Eusebius, Jerome, and Epiphanius resided in the birth-place of the first gospel. Is it not strange therefore, that they found no trace of Matthew's writing in Greek instead of Hebrew? Was it not the

[1] ἐγκρίδες by mistake for ἀκρίδες. [2] μέλι ἄγριον.
[3] ἐγκρὶς ἐξ ἐλαίου.

interest of the catholic Church to preserve the tradition of a Greek original, since it adopted the Greek alone as canonical? When we consider that the original was in the hands of the Nazarenes and Ebionites, disfigured by additions, along with the prevalent opinion of the orthodox fathers that the Aramaean was Matthew's own; does it not appear unaccountable that the catholic Christians should never have adduced the hypothesis of a Greek original? All their prepossessions would have contributed to prevent the true account disappearing so that they could not even hint at the possibility of a Greek, instead of an Aramaean original.

The advocates of a Greek original also reason from the form of the quotations in favour of that hypothesis. Bleek, followed by De Wette, has put the case most skilfully with this object. According to him, the citations in the gospel are of two kinds, viz. those in which the evangelist gives pragmatic indications respecting the fulfilment of expressions in the Old Testament; and those where passages are quoted or used in the course of the narrative, as they occur in the discourses of persons who are introduced speaking. The latter are adduced according to the LXX., sometimes verbally, even in cases where the LXX. depart from the Hebrew; and sometimes with more freedom, but not in such a way as to lead to the supposition of the deviation being due to consultation of the Hebrew text. The former are adduced according to the writer's own translation from the Hebrew, departing not merely from the words, but also the sense of the LXX. whose expressions are seldom seen through the places. This class of citations certainly forms the nucleus of the gospel, because by far the greater part of the sayings of Jesus and others must have existed in the original Aramaean. If therefore they were conceived in Aramaean, why should they be given here in a form corresponding to that of the Greek version, even where it is contrary to

the Hebrew text? And if the translator took such liberty with the one class, why did he not do so with the other ?[1]

The fact that the Messianic passages are everywhere cited after the Hebrew, is obviously favourable to the hypothesis of an Aramaean original. As to the other class which follows the LXX. rather than the Hebrew, the argument founded upon it against an Aramaean original would be of more weight, if the canonical Greek had been derived from Matthew's authentic gospel immediately. But the case is different. It is only the last redaction or edition of successive translations in all of which liberties with the original were freely taken. Why these liberties were not indulged in the discourses and speeches it is difficult to ascertain. But it is conceivable that they may have influenced the one more than the other, while a translation was being made. In the case of passages cited to show the fulfilment of prophecy, exactness is of considerable moment, and therefore they are taken directly from the original. The reason for preserving such exactness ceases in the case of passages from the Old Testament introduced into discourses; and therefore a translator might find it easier and well adapted to his object to employ the LXX. The difference of procedure in the two cases, which is not however invariable, may be accounted for by the different peculiarities of both. Adherence to the original was more required in the one, because it contained proof or argument.

The prevalence of the Greek language in Palestine has been urged by Hug and his followers, as evidence for Matthew's writing in Greek. No valid argument has been adduced to show that Jesus and his apostles habitually spoke in Greek instead of Syro-Chaldaic. Nor

[1] Beiträge zur Evangelien-Kritik, pp. 57, 58.

can it be shown that the latter dialect was *supplanted* by the former, among the Jews and Jewish-christians in Palestine before the destruction of Jerusalem. All evidence goes to prove that the persons for whom Matthew wrote used Aramaean as their vernacular tongue. It is true that Greek was also employed in Judea at the time. But it did not prevail over or suppress the other. Josephus wrote his history of the Jewish war at first in Hebrew or Aramaean, which he calls *native language*;[1] and afterwards rendered it into Greek, which is termed *Ἕλλας γλῶσσα*.[2] The latter he calls a foreign dialect,[3] in relation to himself and his countrymen. His Greek edition was intended for 'those who were under the Roman dominion,' i.e. Greeks, and such others throughout the Roman dominion as used their language. The historian does not mean his Jewish brethren in Palestine, as the context shows. If then Josephus terms Syro-Chaldaic his *native tongue*[4] as contrasted with Greek, to which he applies *a foreign dialect*,[5] which of the two would Matthew writing for the use of his countrymen naturally choose? Even granting that the natives of Palestine were as familiar with Greek as they were with Aramaean, would he prefer a foreign dialect to a native one—to that which was best fitted to procure a favourable hearing? We do not deny that Greek circulated in Palestine to some extent, in the age of Christ and the twelve apostles. But there is abundant evidence to show that Aramaean prevailed, as we infer from the fact that the Septuagint did not supersede the original Hebrew in popular estimation, in Palestine. When therefore it is considered that Matthew, as a Jew, wrote a gospel for the use of his brethren in Palestine, it is reasonable to conclude that he would employ the lan-

[1] *πάτριος γλῶσσα.*
[2] De Bello Judaico, Prooem.
[3] *ξένη διάλεκτος.—Antiq. Prooem.* 2.
[4] *πάτριος γλῶσσα.*
[5] *ξένη καὶ ἀλλοδαπὴ διάλεκτος.*

guage for which they had a predilection. And this is attested by the early fathers.

Diodati and Hug made great efforts to do away with the arguments derived from Josephus and others in favour of the prevalence of Aramaean in Palestine. Since their day others have taken up and repeated, not improved, their arguments, with a perverse ingenuity which cannot be admired, without however shaking the evidence that Matthew wrote in Aramaean. If the early fathers who attest the fact were all mistaken or deceived in the matter, critics of the nineteenth century are very credulous in supposing that the apostle wrote a gospel at all, even the canonical Greek one. Early testimony to the effect that Matthew wrote a Greek gospel does not exist till the time of Apollinaris (about A.D. 180), who could have known nothing certain on the subject, and may have been far more readily mistaken than his predecessors, who testified that Matthew wrote in Hebrew. In fact the supporters of the hypothesis that the apostle wrote the present canonical gospel, are able to adduce no evidence in its favour; and it is only by upholding the voice of all antiquity proclaiming that Matthew wrote a gospel in Aramaean, that any connection between him and the canonical Greek one can be asserted. In explaining away ancient evidence they do away with the fact that Matthew wrote a gospel at all. Hilgenfeld and Volkmar reject the testimony of antiquity, that Matthew wrote any gospel or record of Christ's sayings. In this respect they are consistent. But orthodox critics, who refer the canonical Greek in its present state to the apostle as its author, have no ground to stand upon. Near the end of the second century they can point to Apollinaris, who assigned it to Matthew; before that time, it is always asserted that the apostle wrote in Aramaean not in Greek.

It is needless to notice other arguments, if they

deserve that name, adduced by the advocates of a Greek original written by Matthew himself; such as the existence of the old Syriac being made from the present Greek; a work of supererogation, it is alleged, if an Aramaean original existed; because the Peshito originated after the Greek had been accepted as a canonical production in Syria. The element of time annihilates this objection to an Aramaean original gospel, added to the fact, that the canonical Greek is not a proper version at all. Equally nugatory is it to say with Credner, that the Greek original of the gospel is affirmed by its continual coincidence with the gospels of Mark and Luke, and admits of no explanation on the hypothesis of a translation from the Hebrew. The verbal correspondences in question are owing to the use of Matthew's gospel by Mark and Luke; while no critic argues, that the present Greek gospel is a simple version. It is certainly not an original; but it approaches the nature of one by the forms through which it passed, from the time of its incipient derivation from the Aramaean. It is also irrelevant to affirm, with Olshausen, that, while all the fathers of the Church assert that Matthew wrote in Hebrew, they make use of the Greek text universally as a genuine apostolic composition; as if these writers, living so late, had any choice in the matter. They had not an opportunity of seeing the Aramaean, which, in their times, was in the hands of the Judaising Christians; and had they been able to procure it, they could not have read it. The Greek alone was within their reach, which they accepted as Matthew's, without any definite authority for the authorship. Tradition regarded it as such, and they fell in with it. As to Olshausen's other statements about the Greek being received by all parties, and no objections being made to it by the opponents of the catholic Church, the same answer suffices. Whatever *opponents of the Church* may mean, they could not adduce objections to the Greek as long as they were

totally ignorant of the Hebrew gospel, nor would it have been for their interest to have done so. They accepted the tradition of the relation of the Greek to the apostle. The heretical Nazarenes and Ebionites alone having, as they thought, the authentic work, used it more or less; though they too, being uncritical, would hardly have objected to the indirectly apostolic origin of the Greek.

The exact relationship of Matthew's to the Greek gospel that bears his name is uncertain. Jerome says, that the person who translated the Aramaean original was unknown. The apostle himself was not the translator; for the supposition that he published two works, one in Aramaean and another in Greek, is baseless. It is equally conjectural to assert that some of his friends or disciples rendered the Hebrew gospel into Greek under his sanction, or with his approval. Were the latter hypothesis worth a moment's notice, the question might still be asked, What evidence exists for identifying the present Greek gospel with the version of the friend or disciple? Should it be said that he *composed* the Greek gospel rather than translated, the assertion would be equally unfounded. Apologists have indulged in many assumptions which are often of the strangest sort: for example, that the Aramaean and Greek gospels existed for some time in their important parts as an oral tradition side by side; that the Aramaean was the first committed to writing, circulating chiefly among the Jewish-christians in Palestine; and that the Greek oral gospel, its counterpart, was afterwards put into a written form when the Hellenistic Jews felt the want of it. The latter was made in the time of the apostle, probably under his eye, or even by himself!

There is no real evidence to connect the present gospel with Matthew. The oldest witness in favour of such relationship is a fragment of Apollinaris bishop of Hierapolis (A.D. 180) who says, that the Quarto-

decimans, as they have been called, appealed to Matthew for their view of the paschal supper being on the fourteenth of Nisan, which can only mean that they referred to the present Greek gospel.[1] In what manner or from what cause, the canonical Greek came to be assigned to the apostle cannot be determined. The most probable reason is, that it bears a relationship more or less distant to the authentic Aramaean; not that of a version, since the marks of a version are wanting, but of a work founded upon the latter. It is unlikely that Jerome would have translated the Gospel of the Hebrews, which he identified with the Aramaean of Matthew, had the Greek canonical gospel which existed in his day been a simple version of the same original. Hence it is probable that the present Greek gospel was *based upon* the Aramaean of Matthew, or in other words, the Gospel according to the Hebrews. It originated in the latter, and thus the name of the apostle was transferred from the older to the more recent document, by those who had little knowledge, if any, of the process of derivation. The steps by which it arose out of the Aramaean are unknown. Different translations had preceded it, enlarged more or less by traditional materials, just as the Aramaean itself received corrections in its transmission. Oral sayings, apocryphal narratives, mythic elements, furnished the writer with materials, who proceeded to put the whole into a shape which commended itself to the catholic Christians as far superior to the imperfect and fragmentary Greek gospels which preceded. The latter probably retained more of the character of versions, though indifferent ones; versions that ceased to represent the original faithfully because of their looseness as well as their omissions and additions, while the former lost the nature of a version under the plastic hand of the individual who moulded it into its present form by removing several peculiarities and substitut-

[1] Chron. Pasch. Alex., ed. Bonn., vol. i. p. 14.

ing more. With such probabilities the critic must be contented, in the absence of definite information. The canonical Greek is the result of preceding gospels resembling it in substance, but neither so comprehensive nor so well digested. Ecclesiastical writers, who lived so long after the apostle's death that they could know nothing reliable on the point of Matthew's connection with the Greek gospel, were ready to receive it as his; for they were uncritical enough to believe many things which have not the support even of credible tradition. If, therefore, it be objected that there is no external evidence for various recensions or redactions of the gospel, it may be said, with equal truth or more, that there is no valid external evidence, to show that Matthew wrote it. Besides, the Gospel according to the Hebrews was one form of the canonical gospel, so that external evidence is not wholly wanting on behalf of one recension at least. We allow that the 'oracles,' as Papias terms Matthew's composition, must have been a small and imperfect record of what Jesus said and did; that the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, even in its early state, had departed from primitive simplicity, and was being constantly added to or altered; and that the canonical Greek, compared with it, must be substantially another work.

The majority of critics believe in some connection between the Gospel of the Hebrews and the present Greek Matthew, making it at least one document which the evangelist used in a Greek recension or version. One thing is certain, that it was highly esteemed and used by the early fathers—Papias, Hegesippus, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome, most of whom took it for the original Hebrew Matthew. It is impossible to tell its extent, because it varied, but we know, from the stichometry of Nicephorus, that a Greek translation of it had 2,200 *stichoi*, the canonical Matthew having 2,500, and Mark 2,000.[1] Even Nicephorus does

[1] Credner's Geschichte des N. T. Kanon, p. 242, *et seq.*

not put it among the apocryphal books of the New Testament, but among the Antilegomena, as Eusebius also does.

APOSTOLICITY.

The following phenomena in the gospel are adverse to its having been composed in its present state by an apostle and eye-witness, and therefore to its being an exact version of a gospel written by Matthew.

1. It contains several unhistorical and mythical elements. The most palpable example of this is in xxvii. 52, where we are told, that at the expiration of Jesus the graves were opened, and many bodies of the saints who slept arose, came out of their resting-places after the resurrection of their Lord, and even went into the holy city, where they appeared to many. The apocryphal nature of this account is apparent.

Again, the narrative in xxvii. 62–66, xxviii. 11–15 respecting the setting of a watch at the sepulchre, and the bribing of them, is historically improbable. The chief priests and Pharisees could not have known of Jesus saying that he would rise again after three days, because he did not foretell this in an intelligible way even to his disciples (xvi. 21). Had the women known of the watch being set at the sepulchre, they would not have confined their attention to the rolling away of the stone and the anointing of the body. And the conduct of the sanhedrists is unaccountable in instructing the soldiers to spread a false report, instead of calling them to account for their delinquency. It is not likely that they would have acted towards Pilate as is represented, or that he would have been satisfied with their representation.

2. Some things are put in a wrong order, and are therefore chronologically incorrect. Thus the sermon on the mount, which is intended for an inaugural discourse, is placed too early. It was delivered not only

before the immediate disciples of Jesus, but a large multitude of people assembled to hear; implying that Jesus had exercised his ministry for a considerable time and attracted the attention of the multitude to himself, so that their minds were prepared, to some extent, for a discourse of comprehensive and high-toned morality. And the passages in it which imply that Jesus was the Messiah, v. 17 and vii. 21–24, are anticipative, as we infer from xvi. 17. To have announced himself as the Messiah so early would have been contrary to his cautious and gradual introduction of that idea, especially as the minds of his hearers were unsusceptible of it at the time.

In like manner, the charge of Jesus to the twelve in x. 19 &c., is introduced too soon, the disciples being told that the Son of Man should come again to set up his kingdom before they had gone over the cities of Israel. Thus his second advent is announced as just at hand. If the discourse here be not out of place, it is inconsistent with xxiv. 14, where the second advent is spoken of as a much later event. Either supposition does not harmonise with the apostolic composition of x. 19 &c., or its correct recording.

3. Things are related in a way which shows the mixture of later tradition. Thus the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew speaks first of the destruction of Jerusalem; and, from the twenty-ninth verse, of the coming of Messiah immediately after, which was not fulfilled. There is therefore some inaccuracy in reporting the discourse of Jesus on this occasion. In like manner, the signs and wonders preceding the destruction of Jerusalem do not correspond to facts. False Messiahs did not appear then; nor did any important wars take place, as is intimated in the sixth and seventh verses of the chapter. Koestlin,[1] in his successful

[1] Der Ursprung und die Composition der synoptischen Evangelien, p. 113, *et seq.*

attempt to disprove Baur's reference of the chapter to the time of Hadrian rather than the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, has not shown how all the traits described suit the latter period. Only some do.

4. Other particulars are wrongly narrated, as is the case with the miraculous feeding of the four thousand men in the wilderness very soon after a similar event. (Compare xv. 32–38 with xiv. 16–21.) One thing is doubled, as the facts are substantially the same, the minor circumstances alone being different. The disciples of Jesus who had witnessed the feeding of five thousand men so recently and under like conditions, would hardly have been so forgetful or thriftless as to ask, 'Whence should we have so much bread in the wilderness as to fill so great a multitude?' In like manner, the same transaction is repeated in ix. 32–34 and xii. 22–30. The two passages are so similar that we must assume a double narrative of the same event. A similar repetition of the same thing appears in xvi. 1, where the event in xii. 38 is re-enacted. In the former place we are told that the Pharisees and Sadducees asked of Jesus a sign from heaven, when it is improbable that two such opposite parties should have united in presenting the same demand. The Sadducees were persons not likely to join with the Pharisees either in this matter or others.

Again, Jesus is represented as riding into Jerusalem on two animals, an ass and a colt, which has arisen from misunderstanding the prophecy referred to (xxi. 2, 7, compared with Zech. ix. 9). Nor is this the only instance in which the sense of a passage in the Hebrew Scriptures has been turned aside to make it apply to Jesus; or in which the narrative has not been modified to suit a supposed prediction. In Zechariah only one animal is alluded to, named in two parallel members.[1]

[1] חמור and עיר.

This is converted into two in xxi. 2, 'an ass and a colt with her;' a phrase excluding Meyer's idea that the *and* in xxi. 7, 'an ass *and* a colt,' is epexegetical (*even*).

Again, in xii. 39 &c., the writer puts an erroneous interpretation of the disciples into the mouth of their Master in the fortieth verse; for the allusion to the resurrection of Jesus is foreign to the original connection, as well as to the view with which the preceding and subsequent verses were spoken. Jesus did not mean that *his resurrection* was a sign to the generation then alive, but *his preaching*. This corresponds with the sign of Jonas the prophet to the Ninevites; which, according to Luke xi. 29-31, was not his abode in the fish.

The words said to be addressed to the apostles by Jesus after his resurrection (xxviii. 19, 20) savour of a later time. We learn from the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles that baptism was always *into the name of Christ*, or *into Christ*. Such seems to have been the early mode of initiation. After more reflection was applied in unfolding the relation of Christ to the Father and the Spirit, the formula 'into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit' arose. It is not original, and could hardly have been prescribed by Jesus himself.

From xxviii. 9–20 we see that every appearance of the risen Saviour to the disciples in Judea is excluded. Nothing but one Galilean appearance is alluded to. How could an apostle have been ignorant of Judean manifestations? Had he known them, he could hardly have omitted all reference to them. Hence this part of the gospel betrays an unapostolic tradition. In accordance with it is the fact that the ministry of Jesus is confined to Galilee. If Matthew were acquainted with his doings and teachings in Judea, why did he ignore them? No answer can be given to this question; and therefore the non-apostolic cannot be excluded from the gospel.

Again, the narrative of the temptation of Jesus

assumes a historical shape, as if an outward and real occurrence were recorded. Though intended by the writer for history, it cannot be accepted as such. It is either ideal or mythical; or thoughts suggested to the mind of Jesus were transformed by later tradition into an actual objective history. In any case, the thing which is here described did not happen as it is depicted. It may have a basis of fact; the narration is certainly unapostolic.

5. Some things partake of a character so marvellous as to warrant their non-apostolic description. So in xvii. 27, respecting the piece of money in a fish's mouth provided for tribute. The miracle seems to be unnecessary, since a stater might have been procured in the usual way. Nor did Jesus ever work a miracle for himself. Besides, it is not said that the piece of money was actually found in the mouth of the fish. The accomplishment is not noticed, as on other occasions. And while it is certainly possible that the piece of money may have been in the fish's mouth—for cases of this sort have occurred—it is not probable that the money would have been there ready for use, rather than in the stomach. The miracle is gratuitous.

Such are the surest evidences of non-apostolicity in the first gospel. They are not the only phenomena which might be adduced, but they are the most reliable. It is precarious to rest upon phenomena which are supposed to be incorrect because they disagree with parts of the other gospels. The reasoning which gives the preference to the accounts of Mark, Luke, or John, and judges of parallel accounts in Matthew accordingly, is justly liable to suspicion. We do not say that all particulars in the first gospel are more correct than those in the other synoptists; but that most of them are. Sometimes the original tradition is preserved by Mark or Luke, when a later one is given by Matthew; as in xxvii. 34, where the drink offered to

Jesus is vinegar *mingled with gall*, which he would not drink, because of its bitter taste; whereas in Mark it was mingled with *myrrh*, to produce intoxication and ease pain. The tradition respecting the gall is a later one, derived from Psalm lxix. 21, and converting the draught into a manifestation of enmity instead of compassion. But such instances are comparatively few, and do not invalidate the general principle, which is strikingly exemplified in the 28th chapter of St. Matthew, where nothing is said of the mode in which Jesus was parted from his disciples. It is only implied that he had gone to the Father. This idea was subsequently developed as we find it in the other gospels. It is invalid to adduce the want of graphic description in one who was an eye-witness like Matthew. Picturesque delineation does not necessarily belong to an apostle. Vivid description is a talent which does not depend on an external call. And the nature of Matthew's occupation was unfavourable to vivid painting. We could not expect much of the picturesque from a collector of taxes. The graphic power of accomptants is usually feeble. At all events, natural talent is not changed by inspiration. It is spiritualised and elevated. If the writer had not the gift of picturesqueness before he became an apostle, he would not have it after.

If parts of the gospel be unapostolic and later, the question arises how much of it is? Is it all of that nature, or the greater portion? What is the criterion for testing its authentic and non-authentic portions? The reply to these enquiries must depend on an examination of the contents. The ancient evidence that exists is insufficient to connect it with Matthew, except very remotely. Were it not for the Gospel of the Hebrews being ascribed to the apostle, and the distant relation of the present Greek gospel to that originally Aramaean one, we should dismiss the apos-

tolic origin of the gospel as lying out of the reach of present enquiry. Even as it is, we need not be solicitous about vindicating the apostolicity of the contents. Are they original in the main? Are they credible? Do they present the criteria of verisimilitude? A careful analysis of them shows that they do. In substance they appear to be correct. The events are such as seem to have taken place. The discourses attributed to Jesus have the marks of originality, and are worthy of him. The general succession of events is also natural. But it must be admitted that the writer has grouped and combined, in various instances, discourses and parables of similar import which were uttered on different occasions; that the form of his statements has affected the originality of them in several instances, that particulars here and there are of later origin, that the mythical and traditional is clearly perceptible; and that therefore the gospel is non-apostolic in minor particulars. If we could separate the original Aramaean substance from later accretions—from the additions, mutilations, and corruptions to which it was exposed among the Nazarenes and Ebionites, both in its Aramaean and Greek forms—we should be able to see its genuine character as it came from the hands of the apostle himself. But this is impossible. At present we have only the Greek gospel, which bears the impress of an original more than a version.

As to the sources of the gospel, if it be true that Matthew wrote brief Aramaean *oracles* or *discourses*, there is no probability of his using written compilations. He drew from Galilean traditions and actual knowledge. The case of the person who put the Greek gospel into its present shape is different. He had written sources more or less copious; various Greek paraphrases of the original Aramaean. It is also likely that he consulted independent collections of gospel facts, for in no other

way can duplicates of the same thing be explained, the second of which could have been introduced only out of a written source, not from oral tradition. Thus the present gospel is based on the Aramaean document written by the apostle as well as on some smaller collections, with unwritten tradition. There is no argument proving that the writer or compiler used the primitive Mark-document, of which we shall speak hereafter. It is impossible, of course, to assign the respective portions to their respective sources; though earlier and later materials, the historical and unhistorical may be often distinguished. No imperious purpose transformed the general contents so much as to mar their essential credibility. The writer selected, added, altered, not without a theological bias, but without one that gave substance as well as shape to the materials. If these remarks be correct, Holtzmann's distribution of the gospel between two leading documents, the *Logia* or primitive Matthew, the primitive Mark, and tradition, is conjectural; with an unmistakable bias in favour of Mark's originality that does injustice to Matthew.[1] That there was a Greek collection of discourses or sayings written by the apostle Matthew, is destitute of all historical basis. Ancient testimony is unanimous in favour of its being composed in Aramaean. One of the primary documents in Holtzmann's scheme of the mutual connection of the synoptists—a Greek gospel by Matthew—falls away. Nor is there the least probability that any Greek translation circulated as *the acknowledged representative* of the Aramaean *logia*; for Papias's language implies that the versions were numerous and unsatisfactory.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

The gospel may be divided into three parts, viz.: the introductory history, chapters i.–iv.; the Messiah's

[1] Die synoptischen Evangelien u. s. w., p. 169, *et seq.*

ministry in Galilee, v.–xviii.; the conclusion of his work, and death at Jerusalem, xix.–xxviii.

The first portion contains the genealogical register of Jesus, and his birth in Bethlehem; the circumstances connected with his birth, such as the visit of the magi, the flight to Egypt, and the return to Nazareth. This is followed by the manifestation of John and the baptism of Jesus. The 4th chapter describes his temptation and entrance into public life.

There is little doubt that the first two chapters always belonged to the present Greek gospel. They are found in all unmutilated Greek MSS. and ancient versions. The earliest fathers had them in their copies as part of the work. Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Justin Martyr, Hegesippus, attest their existence. So do the early heretics, Cerinthus and his followers, Celsus, and Porphyry. Their diction is of the same character with the rest of the gospel. The language and style are similar. But the question is, Were the chapters in the Gospel according to the Hebrews or the Aramaean logia of St. Matthew? The portion was wanting in the Ebionite copy of the Gospel according to the Hebrews, as Epiphanius testifies. Did the Ebionites cut it off because they denied the miraculous conception of Jesus? Epiphanius says so. He leads us to believe that they mutilated and corrupted the gospel; and his testimony may pass for what it is worth. The same father, in saying of the Nazarenes that they had the gospel in its fullest form or entire, in Hebrew, probably warrants us to conclude that their copy had these chapters; and Jerome's comments on Habbak. iii. 3, and Isai. xi. may justify the inference. But Epiphanius is an untrustworthy writer. As a matter of fact, his testimony respecting the commencement of the gospel of the Ebionites, which was only another and later recension of the Gospel according to the Hebrews with the 3rd chapter of the present

Greek may be accepted, especially as he saw the document. He says expressly of Ebion, that he declared Christ to be the son of Joseph and Mary, just as Cerinthus and Carpocrates did, on the ground of the same gospel. Origen distinguishes two classes of Ebionites, one acknowledging Christ to be born of a virgin, the other not. Following internal evidence, we should be disposed to say, that the chapters did not belong to the original copy. Their contents hang loosely together, and do not harmonise well. The supernatural birth hardly agrees with the genealogy; and the latter terminates in Joseph without expressing the direct connection between him and Jesus. Though the writer intended to give the latter's genealogy, he breaks off abruptly, without specifying the proper link of connection between him and Joseph. The evangelist seems to have adopted a written account, instead of composing the chapters himself out of tradition. If so, he altered the words of the sixteenth verse, to make suitable room for the introduction of the supernatural generation of Jesus; severing, however, by that means the proper link of connection between the preceding and following parts. Of what use was it to trace the descent of Jesus from David, and show his Messiahship, if he had not a natural father? Besides, the first two chapters are largely imbued with the traditional. The ideas expressed respecting the generation of Jesus Christ, the visit of the magi, and the appearance of the miraculous star that guided them, the conduct of Herod towards them, the slaughter of the infants in Bethlehem, and the flight into Egypt, partake of the mythic. They symbolise certain ideas which are easily traced. Thus the supernatural conception is the legendary symbol of a spiritual nature superior to the characteristic type of humanity. It is improbable that an apostle would have set forth such relations as historical. They are too early for his time.

The 4th chapter giving an account of the temptation, narrates it as an outward historical fact, for such expressions as 'the devil taketh him up,' 'the devil setteth him on a pinnacle of the temple,' &c., imply nothing else. This is followed by a rapid outline of the proceedings of Jesus, that the author may come to the full history of the Messianic ministry.

The second division of the gospel begins with the sermon on the mount, which is a sort of programme of the Messianic kingdom founded by Jesus. This discourse is orderly and connected. The development is simple, and the sequence of parts natural. The essential contents appear to be original and direct, leaving an impression of freshness on the mind that cannot be mistaken. A pure ethical spirit, free from all religious dogmatism, breathes throughout the whole; showing that the truths developed came from the moral consciousness of one who had the loftiest, as well as the simplest, ideas of the absolute, in practical ethics. Mosaism is transformed into a spiritual essence; the law partakes of a pure morality. The principles enunciated, unsustained by argument or authority, and in the form of simple assertion, are left to stand self-supported, with a sublime confidence in the majesty of truth. Jesus appears as the reformer of the law, giving it a higher significance than the Pharisaic, or even the original one. He sublimates without abolishing it. But though the substance of the discourse be unquestionably original, it has received its form and position from the evangelist, who has sometimes brought together different utterances of Jesus belonging to different times. The general outline, including the commencement and conclusion, with the intervening succession of ideas, must be genuine; cognate elements are introduced, to expand and fill out the discourse. This conclusion is supported by the fact, that Luke and Mark distribute in different places various sentences which belong to the connected discourse of the first gospel. It is also con-

firmed by the circumstance, that the sermon has the character of being wrought into a united whole, all the parts and particulars being fitted with care into their places. Such elaboration is adverse to the idea that the sermon is exactly the same now as when it was spoken. It is also confirmed by the circumstance that a proper connection between a few sentences here and there is wanting; for example, at the eighteenth verse. In proportion as the sermon exhibits plan and purpose, as a whole and in separate parts, does its originality cease to be direct. Undoubtedly it formed a considerable part of the *discourses* which Matthew wrote; but it is against probability that it was spoken exactly as we have it, and at the commencement of Jesus's ministry. Its true position is later, when the minds of the disciples and people were prepared for such spiritual truth. Luke places it later; and though we cannot assign the preference to his description, either in form or originality, we believe that the time he assigns to it is nearer the truth. Taking the sermon on the mount as the first gospel presents it, it is *relatively* not *absolutely* original. The extent, the regular development of ideas, the compact unity, the logical arrangement, especially in the first part, the palpable evidence of plan, show the influence of reflection. The form is much less original than the contents; though some of these too have been imported into the discourse out of other times and occasions. Thus, the eighteenth and nineteenth verses of the 5th chapter are of later origin, since they disturb the connection, and were never appealed to by Peter, or the Judaising party afterwards, though decidedly authoritative in their favour. When Paulinism had weakened the claims of the law among Christians, those who adhered to the old Judaic Christianity attempted to make it more rigid. But the twentieth and following verses show that Jesus had respect to the spiritual import of the law rather than its external observance, and that he

could not have pronounced him to be great in the kingdom of heaven who conformed to all the minutiae of legal and ceremonial observances.[1] We know that Baur supposes the passage to be original; and endeavours to explain the eighteenth verse, as not sanctioning the perpetuity of all the isolated ritualistic details of Mosaism, but only the general spirit of which they were the embodiment; but this is a critic's refinement rather than the true meaning.[2]

The sermon on the mount is followed by a series of miraculous works which Jesus performed in Galilee, viii.–ix. 38. The cures related and the miracles performed, follow one another in rapid succession. After pronouncing a long discourse, the Saviour is represented as engaged almost entirely in wonderful cures, without distinct or considerable intervals of time. We cannot well resist the conclusion, that the evangelist groups together a number of operations to make a portrait of Jesus's Messianic agency. That such was his object is perceptible from bodily and spiritual states of derangement being equally represented as the subjects of cure; from the calling of Matthew being inserted in the series; from the brief forcible sayings in viii. 18–22; but especially from viii. 17, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities and bare our sicknesses.' Jesus was to fulfil the Old Testament predictions respecting the Messiah's operations. The evangelist groups a series of facts representing the Messiah in close contact with humanity, the Son of man compassionating the condition of his brethren and ministering to their wants. Another aspect of Jesus as the Messiah is here presented. Not so much the ethical reformer introducing a kingdom of righteousness, as a sympathising brother, the Messiah entering

[1] Strauss's Leben Jesu, p. 212.

[2] Vorlesungen über neutestamentliche Theologie, p. 53, *et seq.*

into the peculiar circumstances of men and raising them up from wretchedness to comfort. That the section owes much to the composition of the writer can scarcely be doubted by those who compare it with the sermon on the mount which also partakes of the grouping characteristic belonging to the present portion, as well as the summary introduction of the sermon, 'and Jesus went about all Galilee, teaching in their synagogues, and preaching the gospel of the kingdom, and healing all manner of sickness, and all manner of disease among the people,' &c., &c. (iv. 23–25). The summary owed its present place and character to the evangelist's desire to get at once to the inaugural discourse of Jesus; after which the general assertion is resolved into its details. The writer acts freely in setting the instances of the Messianic operation in rapid succession, that they may give a connected picture. He does not stay to specify times or places exactly. The outward connection of the wonderful works performed evinces the writer's subjectivity and reflection.

A new section begins with the 10th chapter. After Jesus says in ix. 37, 38, 'the harvest truly is plenteous, but the labourers few; pray ye therefore the Lord of the harvest, that he will send forth labourers into his harvest,' we are informed that such labourers were called and sent forth to the work; a series of instructions is given to the apostles respecting their conduct. It is probable that the form of these instructions proceeds from the evangelist, since parts of them are not appropriate to the first mission of the apostles, but are derived from a later period. This is plain from the sixteenth and following verses.

The 11th and 12th chapters open up the further and wider progress of Jesus's ministry, especially the effects which it produced. Its results appear more marked, resolving themselves into adoption or recognition of his Messianic claims. The message of John the Baptist

gives occasion not only to speak of the person and ministry of his forerunner, but of his own reception; while he upbraids the cities in which he had wrought mighty works, because of their inexcusable unbelief. He expresses his union with the Father, in virtue of which he cheerfully acquiesces in all the divine arrangements; and acknowledging that his mission would be believed in only by such as the Father had specially enlightened, he addresses a compassionate call to men to avail themselves of his aid. The 12th chapter represents Jesus in conflict with the Pharisees, and his severe language against them. The collision was caused by the disciples plucking ears of corn on the Sabbath, and also by the cure of a blind and dumb man, which the Pharisees attributed to Satanic agency.

One thing in the 12th chapter has naturally arrested the attention of critics, viz. the charge of Jesus to the multitudes not to make him known (12, 15, 16). In the midst of publicity, while he performed remarkable cures openly and was in collision with the Pharisees, it is stated that he withdrew for the sake of privacy, and enjoined the multitudes, who nevertheless followed him, not to speak of him and his deeds openly. The present is not the only place in the first gospel where such prohibition is recorded (see viii. 4; ix. 30). It is not so strange, however, at an earlier period, when he had not attained great publicity or been thrown into controversy with the Pharisees on account of his works. Here the prohibition is inappropriate. The evangelist himself appears to have felt so when he introduces a passage from Isai. xlii. 1–4, which he applies to the Messiah, as if a leading feature of his character were calmness and noiselessness, the absence of ostentation, the exhibition of a modest retirement, a mild and quiet consolation depositing itself in the minds of men with refreshing power. The inference seems unavoidable that such prohibition on the part of Jesus was not

uttered, since it disagrees with the context in which it stands. The evangelist's adaptation of Isai. xlii. 1–4 to the Messiah, is aside from the true sense of the passage. He must, however, have looked upon the description as an important Messianic criterion.

The 13th chapter contains a group of parables, representing one aspect, the most attractive and influential, of the teaching of Jesus. Though the entire series is narrated as if spoken at one time, this is improbable. The parables were uttered on different occasions, and are unhistorically put into a connected group. The teaching of Jesus in Nazareth, recorded in xiii. 53–58, is identical with that of Luke iv. 16–30, though the latter places it too early. Chapters xiv.–xvii. contain a succession of events and circumstances, without any close connection between them. The narrative of Herod beheading John the Baptist; the feeding of five thousand persons; Jesus's walking on the sea; his cures in the land of Gennesaret; his conflict with the Pharisees, setting out with the question about washing of hands; his discourse to the disciples, showing that what they ought to be most anxious to shun is moral and spiritual, not ceremonial, impurity; the interview with a Canaanitish woman; the feeding of the four thousand, which is merely a duplicate of the preceding occurrence in xiv. 17–21; the demand of the Pharisees for a sign, and the discourse respecting Sadducean and Pharisean leaven; Peter's confession; the transfiguration; the healing of a lunatic, and the narrative respecting the piece of money found in the mouth of a fish, constitute a loosely linked series. But the final catastrophe draws nearer. The opposition of the Pharisees and Sadducees becomes more intense, so that Jesus repeatedly announces to the disciples his death and resurrection (xvi. 21, &c.; xvii. 22, &c.)

The 19th chapter opens up a new epoch in the personal history of Jesus; for he is represented as

leaving Galilee for Judea. On this journey he came into collision with the Pharisees respecting divorce and celibacy, blessed little children, had a conversation with a rich youth, and spoke of the rewards awaiting those who made sacrifices for the kingdom of heaven's sake. To this is appended the parable of labourers in a vineyard, which is peculiar to the first gospel. The request of Zebedee's sons shows how inadequately the minds of the apostles were prepared for the Messianic kingdom. Approaching Jericho, he healed two blind men.

The 21st chapter describes his entry into Jerusalem, the evangelist evidently knowing nothing of his stay in Bethany, his purification of the temple, and cursing of the fig-tree. At the twenty-third verse of this chapter, a question of the Sanhedrists' put to him respecting his authority, leads to three parables in which his opponents are aimed at, the breach between both becoming more open, sharp, and decided. The Pharisees put entangling questions; their enmity increasing as their polemics are turned aside or recoil on their own heads with defeat. In the 23rd chapter, Jesus speaks openly against the scribes and Pharisees, a class of men who had lain in wait for him a considerable time. His denunciation of them is severe, characterised by a tone of stern displeasure, consistent only with the idea that he looked upon them as involved in hopeless and irreconcilable hostility to the gracious purposes of God; and concluding with a valedictory address to Jerusalem of the most mournful character.

The 24th chapter contains a prediction of the destruction of Jerusalem, with the downfall of the Jewish state and Jesus's second coming immediately after. This eschatological discourse harmonises with the sermon on the mount, in regard to free composition. Not only in form, but in matter, does the writer's own subjectivity appear. That Jesus could not have spoken as he is represented, is apparent from the way in which John writes in the Apocalypse respecting

the fate of Jerusalem. For three years and a half the apostle predicts that the city should be trodden down by the Gentiles, but that the temple should be spared. The rest of the city is neither to be possessed nor destroyed by the heathen. It is impossible that the apostle John could have written thus, had he heard Jesus foretell such a catastrophe as is described in the present chapter; and therefore considerable scope must be allowed for both matter and method of the discourse here given. That the nucleus is authentic there is little doubt; but there is great difficulty in extracting it from the surroundings. One thing is pretty clear, that not till after the catastrophe which befell Jerusalem—a catastrophe which none of the early Christians foresaw —did any of the synoptists seek to have it plainly foretold by the Saviour. Had they represented it as less clearly foreshadowed, they might have been nearer the fact.

The chapter before us raises a grave question. Did Jesus believe that he would return in a visible form to inaugurate his reign as Messiah? It is plain that his discourse here, and many other sayings reported by the synoptists, especially Matt. x. 23; xxiii. 36, 39; xxiv. 34; xxvi. 64, contain an explicit prediction of his speedy return to preside at the great judgment of mankind. Did he share the common Messianic belief of his time? So Strauss, Keim, and even Weizsäcker suppose, contrary, as we think, to the evidence of facts in the gospels themselves. He who transformed the contemporary Messianic ideas so radically, enunciating the spirituality and gradual growth of his kingdom, could not have apprehended his Messianic dignity under the vulgar form of current Judaism. In speaking of the future, he made use of the figurative language of the Old Testament, and was misapprehended by his hearers. To harmonise their Judaic hopes with the conviction that the crucified One was the Messiah, the

disciples supposed he would return in a visible form to inaugurate his reign and judge mankind. Without denying the authenticity of the eschatological discourses of Jesus reported in the gospels, we believe that they are reproduced inexactly. Jewish ideas and expressions peculiar to the early disciples are incorporated with them, which obscure their original sense. The spiritual meaning intended by the speaker, veiled as it was under Jewish imagery, is marred by an imperfect apprehension of its import. This opinion, in which we agree with Hase, Schenkel, Colani, and Baur, is not free from difficulties. It is contradicted by the expectation of the early church, especially of Paul, who must have been acquainted with the eschatological discourses of Christ (1 Thess. iv. 15). Assuming misconception on the part of the disciples, when Jesus connected his return with the destruction of Jerusalem, we must idealise such words as those recorded in Matt. xxvi. 64.

Several parables follow, inculcating watchfulness and preparation for the approaching judgment; that of the faithful and the wicked servants, of the ten virgins, of the talents, and a description of the Messianic judgment. The sufferings, death, and resurrection are described in the last three chapters.

The general contents of the gospel appear to be historical, and the course of events natural. One thing succeeds another in regular development. Artificial combination on the part of the evangelist, or transpositions and transmutations, both chronological and material, are not a prominent feature of his ordinary plan. After depicting the ministry of Jesus in Galilee, the close of it in Judea is distinctly described. It is divided into two periods, a Galilean and a Judean one. Yet plausible objections have been made to the authenticity of the contents, derived especially from the other three gospels. If Luke and Mark be considered independent documents having an authority of their own,

the originality of Matthew is lessened. Or if they deserve the preference wherever they deviate from Matthew, the authenticity of the last is damaged. But this estimate cannot be approved. We believe that the first gospel being the oldest, is the principal source of the other two synoptists, whose departures from it fall under a general plan. Hence the critic should be cautious about setting the accounts of Luke and Mark above those of Matthew; or attacking the historical credibility of the first gospel, by the help of the second and third. The only legitimate ground on which Matthew's gospel can be assailed is itself. And there is little fear of its being successfully invaded there, except as to the form which the evangelist has given to many parts, and various subordinate particulars which do not materially affect the body of the work. The principle of grouping which the evangelist has followed, has influenced the character of his narration. What distinguishes the gospel most is its peculiar pragmatism or practical development. Mythical elements certainly appear. The traditional had sufficient time, before the canonical gospel was written, to mould and modify facts. Hence the historical credibility of certain portions is justly suspicious. Both form and substance are coloured with myth here and there. Had we the original Aramaean discourses, some of this hazy element which gathered round the evangelical materials by degrees, would disappear. But even there it was perhaps not wanting entirely, though a meagre sketch necessarily contributed to its absence. It is useless, however, to speak of what is irrecoverable. The present Greek gospel being a growth, and having been written above half a century after the events which it narrates, was affected by the influences of an uncritical age, as well as of convulsive changes and great revolutions that shook the Jewish and Gentile world, filling men's minds with fear and wonder. The only criterion we have for

separating the genuine from the non-historical, is the interpreter's sound judgment or critical sagacity.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE GOSPEL.

1. A Jewish character belongs to the gospel more than to any other. This national narrowness is most observable in xv. 24, where Jesus says that he was sent only to the lost sheep of the house of Israel; in x. 5, where the twelve apostles are forbidden to go among the Gentiles or the Samaritans; and in xix. 28, where the twelve are promised twelve thrones, on which to sit as assessors along with the Messiah, judging the twelve tribes of Israel. The same tendency also appears in the genealogy that reaches up only to Abraham; in the undue stress laid upon works of the law (xii. 33–37; xix. 17; xxv. 31, &c.); in the exaggerated sanctification of the sabbath (xxiv. 20); the pre-eminence given to Peter (x. 2; xvi. 17–19); Jesus's being styled King of the Jews (ii. 2; xxv. 31, &c.); the local and temporal modifications of the second advent (x. 23; xvi. 28), and the eschatology generally which makes the end of Israel synchronous with that of the present world (xxiv. 3, 22; x. 23), the regeneration of the twelve tribes being the object of the present dispensation (xix. 28). To the Mosaic law is also attributed a literal and valid authority under the new covenant, an eternal and indissoluble significance in v. 17–19; so that Christianity is a form or offshoot of Judaism, a genuine, purified development of it.

2. It exhibits diverse elements which cannot be properly harmonised. We have just seen its narrow and Jewish conception of Christianity; but along with this feature it holds out the universal and comprehensive character of the gospel (xxiv. 14; xxviii. 19), even in opposition to the unbelieving people of promise (viii. 10–12; xx. 1, &c., 33, &c.; xxii. 1, &c.). The history

of the Canaanitish woman exalts the heathen, and Jesus declares that he did not find so great faith in Israel as among them (viii. 10; xv. 28). The curse that should come upon the Jewish people (xxvii. 24, 25); the threat that the kingdom should be taken from them, and given to the Gentiles (xxi. 43); the circumstance of the heathen first saluting Christ as king of the Jews (ii. 11, 12); the value attached to the religious and moral element of the law (vii. 12; xxii. 40; xxiii. 33), and the history of the birth of Jesus, so far counterbalance the particularistic and Jewish element. In some places the closing scene of the present age is depicted as near, being inaugurated by the sudden appearance of the Redeemer in his glory (x. 23; xvi. 28; xxiv. 30); while in others the principles of the divine kingdom are said to be unfolded in the natural way by gradual growth (xiii. 31–33). In some places an ascetic influence appears (xix. 12); elsewhere such ascetic constraint is represented as adverse to evangelical freedom. Such features are hardly contradictory; but their complexion disturbs the harmony of parts necessary to a united whole. The Judaic basis is the most prominent. As the earliest form of Christianity was a development of Judaism, and the conceptions entertained of the founder's person, as well as of his teachings by the original apostles, were tinged with Jewish colours, the Jewish element in the gospel is strongly marked. The document that formed the starting-point of the canonical Greek proceeded from Matthew, which explains the prevalence of the Judaic. As Christianity came to be better apprehended in its spirituality and extent, the phases through which the original document passed, took off from its Judaism by incorporating wider views of the new religion. Each successive addition to the original would give it greater breadth of view, because Christians were gradually arriving at the conviction that the new religion was a

far-reaching one, intended to embrace Gentiles as well as Jews, and to leaven mankind with higher principles than those embodied in the Old Testament. Hence the present Greek gospel embraces materials of different times and varying character, whose separation is connected with the historical credibility of the narrative. It is the province of the critic to distinguish mythical and later traditions from the earlier or authentic history, that the whole may not be resolved into mist and marvel. Nor is this impossible. It is indeed sometimes difficult, because the original Gospel according to the Hebrews must have had some non-Judaistic elements, especially where Jesus is the speaker, since he enunciated a comprehensive religion amid the reserve restraining the frequent promulgation of such universality, which he wisely adopted. Christianity, even in its original form, must have had principles capable of enlargement—elements of universal application, which needed only to be expanded. Paul, too, had preached to the Gentiles before the present Greek gospel appeared, openly announcing a divorce between the new and old religions. Still, most instances where the Greek gospel presents an ethical universalism belong to a later time, as in xxiv. 31, in which we read of the elect, including Gentiles and Jews, being gathered together from the four quarters of heaven. But in viii. 11, where Jesus says that many shall come from the east and west to sit down with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven, the comprehensive saying is original. From the word *church* in xvi. 18, and its context, we see a reflection of the time when ecclesiastical organisation existed. The power of the keys bestowed on Peter savours of a later period than the apostolic, and of peculiar privileges assigned to that apostle. The passage, xviii. 15–20, respecting church discipline, arose out of the same ideas and relations as xvi. 17–19.

3. Frequent allusion to passages in the Old Testament is another characteristic feature of the first gospel. The fulfilment of the Old in the New is never lost sight of. What Jesus was and did, his Messianic person and character, were shadowed forth in the Old Testament, so that the evangelical history fulfils predictions given before. Sometimes the citation is made for the sake of the history to which it is adapted. Thus in i. 22, we read that the birth of Jesus from a virgin took place, that what Isaiah had written in vii. 14 might be fulfilled. Micah had predicted his birth in Bethlehem, Matt. ii. 6. Jesus must fly into Egypt that Hosea xi. 1 might be accomplished. Here the history is made for the sake of the citation. When Joseph returned from Egypt with the child and took up his abode in Nazareth, it was that the prophetic saying, 'He shall be called a Nazarene,' might be fulfilled. The same reference to the Old Testament is especially prominent in the 27th chapter. The evangelist's stand-point is much more in the Old Testament than that of any other gospel. The Messiahship of Jesus was an object evidently present to his mind, influencing his treatment of historical particulars by the adaptation of old prophecies and parallels to events in his life.

4. The arrangement of materials in the gospel is generally regular and chronological. Although time does not appear to have been a leading principle, it is commonly observed. The gospel has a chronological character. This is observable from the fact that it is commonly noticed *at what time or on what day* an event happened, or a discourse was held. Indications of time are either general, *in those days* (iii. 1), *at that time* (xi. 25; xii. 1; xiv. 1); or special, such as *in that day* (xiii. 1; xviii. 1; xxii. 23), *after six days* (xvii. 1), *while he spake these things* (ix. 18; xii. 46), *as they went out* (ix. 32), *as they departed* (xi. 7), *when he was come into the temple* (xxi. 23). To the latter belong the

transition-phrases, *when Jesus heard that John was delivered up* (iv. 12), *when he was come down from the mountain* (viii. 1), *when he entered into Capernaum* (viii. 5), *when he came into the house* (viii. 14), *passing thence*, &c., &c. The usual particle of transition is *then*,[1] which occurs ninety times. Chronological arrangement, therefore, is the rule; nor could any other gospel be taken as the basis of a harmony with so much propriety. The grouping together of various sayings and facts has interfered but little with the proper sequence; so that arrangement according to subject-matter and chronological succession, harmonise. Indeed the notices of time often interrupt the flow and thread of the narrative, showing that they were an object of attention to the writer. Thus the story of the magi is introduced by the words, 'Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judea,' as though nothing had been said before about the birth of Jesus. The beginnings of sections have usually notices of time, often in connection with place, so that time and place were not subordinate considerations. Hence we hold that the natural order is commonly observed. It must be admitted that the proper succession is not attended to universally. But the exceptions prove the rule, so that Bishop Marsh, following Eichhorn, was right in preferring Matthew's order to Luke's or Mark's, though the basis on which he grounds it is the incautious statement that the apostle, being an eye-witness of the facts recorded, must have known the time in which each of them happened, a statement applicable at most to the Aramaean ground-work, but necessarily incorrect in relation to the canonical Greek gospel.

LEADING OBJECT.

The leading object of the evangelist has been anticipated in the preceding paragraph. It has been said that

[1] τότε.

he was influenced by a Judaising tendency, which is correct in a certain sense. It was certainly not his intention to pourtray the kingly character of Christ; nor is the tone throughout kingly and majestic, as has been absurdly said. The evangelist is as far as possible from looking at things in a grand, general aspect, indifferent to details, and sacrificing both time and place to groups of discourses, parables, or miracles. Such one-sided delineation is alien to the simplicity observable in the work, in which grandeur does not prevail; while time and place are sacrificed far less than in the other synoptists.

The general purport of the gospel is to show that Jesus was the Messiah promised to the Jews, and that he was their Saviour, though they would not recognise him as such. It has a direct didactic purpose, viz. to strengthen Jewish-christianity. Christ is set forth, not in opposition to the Mosaic law, but as establishing its legitimate claims and bringing out its true meaning. His doctrine is set above the Pharisaic apprehension of the law, not above its proper signification, being the spiritual essence of the whole. This design appears in the quotations from the Old Testament, and in the turn given to parts of the old history that they may suit the life of Jesus. Former events become typical of later ones and are repeated, such as, the sojourn in Egypt, with the exodus, and the Sinaitic legislation. It cannot be denied, therefore, that the historical narrative is sometimes shaped by the writer regarding the ministry of Jesus as intended for his own people. In conformity with the same design, we see in the discourses and sayings, a preference for what relates to the Jews and their relation to the law. 'I am not sent but to the lost sheep of the house of Israel,' has been shaped in the mould of the evangelist, and is turned aside from its original sense. The entire gospel shows a Christianity in alliance with Judaism, not as represented by its

sects, for their views and interpretations of it are combated, but as a divine system testifying to a future Messiah who should redeem his people. Hence it has a theocratic stamp. It is plain that the work was not written in the interest of the Jewish-christian party, when they came to be distinct from other Christians of a freer tendency, but in their interest when they were still an integral portion of the Church. It was meant for the use of the Jewish-christians generally, to satisfy their wants and promote their faith. The writer shows them that the Messiah had come, that the prophetic Scriptures were fulfilled in Jesus, and that they should emancipate themselves from all traditional interpretations of the law. While Jesus assumes an attitude of hostility to the scribes and Pharisees, to the chief priests and Sadducees, confronting and refuting their traditions, he never denounces the law itself.

TIME OF WRITING.

The question as to the time when the gospel was written, hardly admits of a definite answer, because of the way in which the work originated. Matthew wrote the substance in Aramaean; that was translated into Greek, and received additions, modifications, and changes from traditional accounts, till it became fixed at last in its present form, constituting the canonical gospel. Hence indications of time, if such there be, are different. Some belong to the original, and are therefore early; others proceeding from the final redactor are late. A work which attained its present state by various steps, cannot exhibit conclusive evidence of a single date.

It is most probable that Matthew wrote before the destruction of Jerusalem. Irenaeus testifies that the gospel originated after A.D. 60 and before A.D. 70, 'when Peter and Paul were preaching and founding the church

in Rome.' But Peter did not lay the foundation of the church in Rome. It had been planted nine or ten years before. Bishop Marsh thinks that the verb *to found*,[1] as used by Irenaeus, means no more than *to build up* or *confirm*, not to lay the first foundation; which is contrary to its obvious sense. The testimony of the present father is precarious. Though he belonged to the second century, and had better means of knowing the truth than succeeding writers, his statements must be judged by their inherent probability. He is so far correct as to make the apostle write after A.D. 60, and before the destruction of Jerusalem. With this agree various parts of the gospel which presuppose the existence of the life of the people in Palestine (viii. 4; x. 23; xxiii. 2), &c., and of the temple-worship (v. 23; xvii. 24–27; xxiii. 16, &c. 21).

The 24th chapter has been appealed to more than any other part to determine the date of the gospel. But the exegetical difficulties belonging to it detract from the directness of its evidence. That the prophecy refers to the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus is clear, notwithstanding Baur's opinion. Three particulars are observable, *the beginning of sorrows*, *the actual destruction of the city and temple*, and *the return of the Messiah in glory*. The last is said to be *soon after*[2] the second event, which creates perplexity, especially in connection with the language of the thirtieth verse. So does the word *generation* in the thirty-fourth verse,—which must be referred to the contemporaries of Jesus, not to a period of about 100 years, as Baur and others understand it. The general description shows that it was written at the commencement of the disasters which befell the Jewish nation and terminated in its downfall, between A.D. 66 and 70. This implies that the section belonged to the original Aramaean Matthew, and was not essentially altered afterwards. At the

[1] θεμελιόω. [2] εὐθέως.

same time, the chapter itself contains marks of a time posterior to A.D. 70, belonging of course to the canonical Greek gospel. If substantial portions of the early gospel remain, the influence of late events is also seen. Amid the calamities connected with the destruction of the metropolis, the signs of the Messiah's coming here given, false Messiahs, earthquakes, disastrous wars, persecutions causing many Christians to apostatise, did not occur. They are projected backward from a later period. The free composition of the evangelist even puts them into the mouth of Jesus as predictions.

There is an expression twice used in the gospel, *until this day* (xxvii. 8; xxviii. 15), implying a considerable interval between the event and its record; but how long it is impossible to tell, probably twenty years.

In addition to other notices, some refer to xxiii. 35, identifying Zechariah there mentioned with Zechariah son of Baruch, who was slain in the temple about the time of the destruction of Jerusalem, as Josephus relates. Others think that the Zechariah meant was son of Jehoiada the priest (2 Chron. xxiv. 19–24), who, though not the last prophet slain by the Jews, for Urijah was later (Jer. xxvi. 23), is the last in the Old Testament canon. The former agrees better with the context.

These and other internal marks of time are not precise in determining the exact date of the present Greek gospel. The words of Papias imply that it was in circulation before he wrote, though he did not rely upon it, thinking that the Greek had almost suppressed the authentic Matthew, and therefore choosing to trust to oral tradition for 'what Matthew said.' The baptismal formula, with such passages as xvi. 19; xviii. 17; xxiv. 14, prevent the critic from putting the canonical gospel before A.D. 100.

If we could tell the precise dates of the epistles of Barnabas and Clemens Romanus, we might be guided near the truth, but they are uncertain. The

epistle of Clement does not recognise the existence of the gospel, as we see from its citations. If it were written, as Koestlin supposes, between A.D. 90 and 96, the gospel would be later. But that date is not established; as is evident from the fact, that Volkmar makes it A.D. 125. The epistle of Barnabas clearly recognises the gospel's existence,[1] since there is an allusion to Matt. xx. 16, in the fourth chapter; but there is a peculiarity about this quotation which neutralises the evidence it would otherwise give. Nothing is known of the epistle's date, except that it is probably the first quarter of the second century. Volkmar cannot be far wrong in fixing it at A.D. 118–119.

The place of writing the Aramaean is uniformly said to have been Judea. Whether it appeared first at Jerusalem cannot be ascertained. Where the Greek gospel was composed is uncertain.

STYLE AND DICTION.

The language of the gospel is more Hebraic than that of the other three, and accords with the fact of its ultimate derivation from an Aramaean original.

1. The usual formula prefixed to passages cited from the Old Testament, to prove the Messiahship of Jesus is, 'that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet (i. 22; ii. 15); which is usually abbreviated in ii. 5 and later chapters (ii. 17; iii. 3; iv. 14; viii. 17; xii. 17; xiii. 14, 35; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56: xxvii. 9). The formula τοῦτο δὲ ὅλον γέγονεν ἵνα, κ.τ.λ. is particularly deserving of notice (i. 22; xxi. 4; xxvi. 56). In these and similar citations, the expressions ῥηθείς, ῥηθέν, ἐρρήθη (διὰ) nineteen times, are peculiar to Matthew.

2. The expression, 'Son of David,' is applied to Jesus eight times. In Mark and Luke it is less frequent.

[1] Comp. c. 5 with Matt. ix. 13, xxvi. 13; c. xix. with Matt. xix. 19.

3. Jerusalem is called 'the holy city' and 'the holy place' (iv. 5; xxiv. 15; xxvii. 53).

4. The phrase *συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος*, *end of the age* or *dispensation*, occurs five times. The only other example of a similar phrase is in the epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 26).

5. 'Kingdom of heaven,' is a favourite expression of the gospel, as it occurs thirty-two times. The other synoptists have *kingdom of God* instead. The latter, however, occurs in Matt. vi. 33; xii. 28; xix. 24; xxi. 31, 43.

6. 'Heavenly Father,' is used five times; and, 'Father in heaven,' sixteen times.

7. *κατ' ὄναρ*, occurs six times.

8. *προσέρχεσθαι* and *πορεύεσθαι* are used in the oriental manner, by way of expanding a discourse (iv. 3; viii. 5, 19, 25; ix. 14, 20; xiii. 10, 27, 36, &c., ii. 9; ix. 13; xi. 4; xvii. 27, &c.). The former occurs fifty-one times; but in Mark it is used only six times, and in Luke ten times.

9. *σφόδρα* is always put after a verb (ii. 10; xvii. 6, 23; xviii. 31; xix. 25; xxvi. 22; xxvii. 54). It occurs but once in Mark and in Luke.

10. *τότε* is the usual particle of transition. It occurs ninety-one times; but only six times in Mark, and fourteen in Luke.

11. *καὶ ἐγένετο ὅτε* (vii. 28; xi. 1; xiii. 53; xix. 1; xxvi. 1). Luke has *ὅτε δὲ ἐγένετο, καὶ ὅτε ἐγένετο.*

12. *ἕως οὗ* occurs seven times. Luke has oftener *ἕως ὅτου.*

13. *ποιεῖν ὡς, ὥσπερ, ὡσαύτως, καθώς*, commonly with *προσέταξεν* or the like (i. 24; vi. 2; xx. 5; xxi. 6; xxvi. 19; xxviii. 15). Luke employs *ποιεῖν ὁμοίως* and other expressions.

14. *τάφος* occurs six times. The other evangelists never use it but either *μνῆμα* or *μνημεῖον*, the latter being also in Matthew.

15. *συμβούλιον λαβεῖν* (xii. 14; xxii. 15; xxvii. 1, 7; xxviii. 12).

16. *ἰδού* after a genitive absolute occurs nine times. In introducing something new, *καὶ ἰδού* is employed.

17. Adverbs are usually put after the imperative. *Οὕτως* is an exception.

18. *προσκυνεῖν* takes the dative case ten times, the accusative but once. Mark also has the dative; Luke and John oftener the accusative.

19. *ὀμνύω εἰς* or *ἐν* is a Hebraism not used by the other evangelists.

20. *λέγων* frequently occurs without the dative of a person; vii. 21, is an exception.

21. *Ἱεροσόλυμα* is always the name of Jerusalem, except in xxiii. 37.

22. *ὁ λεγόμενος* is a favourite expression in announcing names or surnames, being used of Christ (i. 16; xxvii. 17, 22), of Matthew (ix. 9), of Peter (iv. 18; x. 2), of Caiaphas (xxvi. 3), of Iscariot (xxvi. 14), and also of names of places (ii. 23; xxvi. 36; xxvii. 33).

23. 'Now the birth of Jesus was thus' (i. 18); 'now the names of the twelve apostles are these' (x. 2). introduce sentences peculiar to the gospel.

24. *Εἰπεῖν τι κατά τινος*, v. 11; xii. 32.

25. Matthew prefers adding 'of the people' to the *scribes* or *elders*, ii. 4; xxi. 23; xxvi. 3, 47; xxvii. 1, to which there is some approach in *οἱ πρῶτοι τοῦ λαοῦ* (Luke xix. 47), and *τὸ πρεσβυτέριον τοῦ λαοῦ* (Luke xxii. 66).

26. *Εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, x. 41, 42; xviii. 20; xxviii. 19. The other evangelists have *ἐν* and *ἐπί*.

27. *Πᾶς ὅστις*, vii. 24; x. 32; xix. 29. Luke has *πᾶς ὅς*.

28. *Ἀκούσω* for *ἀκούσομαι*, xii. 19; xiii. 14, 15.

29. *Μέχρι τῆς σήμερον*, xi. 23; xxviii. 15, and *ἕως τῆς σήμερον*, xxvii. 8, peculiar to Matthew.

30. *Οὗτος γάρ* is peculiar to Matthew iii. 3; vii. 12;

xi. 10. Luke has *κατὰ ταῦτα γάρ* twice, and *ἅπαντες γὰρ οὗτοι* once, while Mark has *εἰς τοῦτο γάρ*; but neither has *οὗτος γάρ*. Similarly *οὕτῳ γάρ* is peculiar to Matthew: ii. 5; iii. 15; v. 12.

31. The preposition *ἀπό* is a favourite with Matthew, even after verbs with which other New Testament writers connect *ἐκ*, as after *ἐγείρεσθαι* (xiv. 2; xxvii. 64; xxviii. 7), and *διεγείρεσθαι* (i. 24).

32. Verbs in *εύειν* are favourites with Matthew, as *μαθητεύειν, δεσμεύειν, ἐπιγαμβρεύειν, παγιδεύειν, ἀγγαρεύειν*, &c.

33. *Ἀναχωρεῖν* occurs ten times; in Mark but once, and only three times in the New Testament besides.

34. *Ἐπάνω* nine times. Mark has it but once; Luke five times.

35. *Ἡγεμών* ten times. Mark has it once, and Luke twice.

36. *Ὅπως* eighteen times. In Mark twice, in Luke seven times.

37. *Συνάγειν* twenty-four times. In Mark five times, and in Luke seven.

38. *Ὕστερον* seven times. Mark has it once, and Luke twice.

39. *Φρόνιμος* seven times. Luke has it twice.

40. The following are peculiar to the gospel, *ἀγγεῖον, ἄγχιστρον, ἀθῷος, αἷμα δίκαιον, αἱμορροεῖν, αἱρετίζειν, ἀκμήν, ἀκριβοῦν, ἀναβιβάζειν, ἀνάἰτιος, ἄνηθον, ἀπονίπτειν, ἀργύρια* (plural), *ἄρτι, Βάρ, βασανιστής, βαττολογεῖν, βιαστής, δάνειον, ὁ δεῖνα, δέσμη, διακωλύειν, διαλλάττεσθαι, διασαφεῖν, δίδραχμον, διέξοδος, διετής, διστάζειν, διυλίζειν, διχάζειν, διψᾶν, ἑβδομηκοντάκις, ἔγερσις, ἐγὼ Κύριε, ἐθνικός, εἰδέα, εἰρηνοποιός, ἐκλάμπειν, Ἐμμανουήλ, ἐμπορία, ἐμπρήθειν, ἐνθυμεῖσθαι, ἐξορκίζειν, ἐξώτερος, ἐπικαθίζειν, ἐπισπείρειν, ἐρεύγεσθαι, ἐρίφιον, ἑταῖρος, εὐδία, εὐνοεῖν, εὐνουχίζειν, εὐρύχωρος, ζιζάνια, θαυμάσιος, Θεέ* (vocative), *θεριστής, θησαυροί* (plural), elsewhere only in Hebrews xi. 26, *θυμοῦσθαι, ἰῶτα, καθη-*

γητής, καταθεματίζειν, καταμανθάνειν, καταποντίζεσθαι, κῆτος, κόλασις, elsewhere only in 1 John iv. 18, κουστωδία, κρυφαῖος, κύμινον, κώνωψ, μεταίρειν, μαλακίαι, μαθητεύειν, μεταμέλεσθαι, μετοικεσία, μισθοῦσθαι, μύλων, νόμισμα, νυστάζειν, also in 2 Peter ii. 3, οἰκετεία, οἰκιακός, οὐδαμῶς, παγιδεύειν, παραθαλάσσιος, παρακούειν, παρομοιάζειν, παρουσία, παροψίς, πέλαγος only in Acts xxvii. 5 besides, πλατύς, πολυλογία, πρᾶος, προσφέρειν δῶρον, προφθάνειν, πυρράζειν, ῥακά, ῥαπίζειν, σαγήνη, σείειν, σεληνιάζεσθαι, σιτιστός, σμύρνα, στατήρ, συναίρειν λόγον, συνάντησις, συναυξάνεσθαι, συντάττειν, τάλαντον, ταφή, τελευτή, τηροῦντες *a watch*, τραπεζίτης, τρύπημα, φράζειν, φυλακτήριον, φυτεία, χαλεπός, χλαμύς, χρυσός, ψευδομαρτυρία, ψύχεσθαι.[1]

QUOTATIONS FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT.

†i. 23	Isaiah vii. 14.
*ii. 6	Micah v. 1.
†ii. 15	Hosea xi. 1.
†ii. 18	Jeremiah xxxi. 15.
*iii. 3	Isaiah xl. 3, &c.
*iv. 4	Deuteronomy viii. 3.
*iv. 6	Psalm xci. 11, 12.
*iv. 7	Deuteronomy vi. 16.
*iv. 10	Deuteronomy vi. 13.
†iv. 15, 16	Isaiah ix. 1, 2.
*v. 5	Psalm xxxvii. 11.
*v. 21	Exodus xx. 13.
v. 27	Exodus xx. 14.
†*v. 31	Deuteronomy xxiv. 1.
†*v. 33	Levit. xix. 12; Deut. xxiii. 23.
*v. 38	Exodus xxi. 24.
*v. 43	Leviticus xix. 18.
viii. 4	Leviticus xiv. 12.
†viii. 17	Isaiah liii. 4.
*ix. 13	Hosea vi. 6.
x. 35, 36	Micah vii. 6.
xi. 5	Isaiah xxxv. 5; xxix. 18.
*xi. 10	Malachi iii. 1.
xi. 14	Malachi iv. 5.
xii. 3	1 Samuel xxi. 6.
xii. 7	Hosea vi. 6.
†xii. 17–21	Isaiah xlii. 1–4.

[1] Theologische Jahrbücher by Zeller, vol. ii. p. 445, *et seq.*

xii. 40	Jonah i. 17.
xii. 42	1 Kings x. 1.
*xiii. 14, 15	Isaiah vi. 9.
†xiii. 35	Psalm lxxviii. 2.
*xv. 4	Exodus xx. 12 and xxi. 17.
*xv. 8, 9	Isaiah xxix. 13.
xvii. 2	Exodus xxxiv. 29.
xvii. 11	Malachi iii. 1; iv. 5.
xviii. 16	Deuteronomy xix. 15.
xix. 4	Genesis i. 27.
*xix. 5	Genesis ii. 24.
*xix. 7	Deuteronomy xxiv. 1.
*xix. 18	Exodus xx. 12, &c.
xix. 19	Leviticus xix. 18.
†xxi. 5	Zechariah ix. 9.
xxi. 9	Psalm cxviii. 25, 26.
*xxi. 13	Isaiah lvi. 7; Jeremiah vii. 11.
*xxi. 16	Psalm viii. 3.
*xxi. 42	Psalm cxviii. 22, 23.
*xxii. 24	Deuteronomy xxv. 5.
*xxii. 32	Exodus iii. 6, 16.
*xxii. 37	Deuteronomy vi. 5.
*xxii. 39	Leviticus xix. 18.
*xxii. 44	Psalm cx. 1.
*xxiii. 38	Psalm lxix. 25.
*xxiii. 39	Psalm cxviii. 26.
*xxiv. 15	Daniel ix. 27.
xxiv. 29	Isaiah xiii. 10.
*xxvi. 31	Zechariah xiii. 7.
xxvi. 64	Daniel vii. 13.
†xxvii. 9, 10	Zechariah xi. 13.
xxvii. 35	Psalm xxii. 19.
xxvii. 43	Psalm xxii. 8.
xxvii. 46	Psalm xxii. 1.

The citations marked thus (†) are of the first class referred to by Bleek, in which the evangelist gives indications of the fulfilment of Old Testament statements, and cites independently of the LXX. from the Hebrew text, departing, in most instances, not only from the words but the sense of the Greek version. Those marked thus (*) belong to the second class, in which the LXX. are mostly followed, either verbally, even where they deviate from the original as in iii. 3; xiii. 14, &c. or freely, the liberty taken not having arisen from consulting the Hebrew.

Three of the first class exactly correspond to the Hebrew text, viz. ii. 15; viii. 17; xiii. 35. Four refer mainly to the Hebrew, but show a partial influence of the LXX. upon them—ii. 18; iv. 15; xii. 17–21; xxi. 5. One agrees with the Septuagint, i. 23. Few of the second class show any dependence on the Hebrew. xi. 10 corresponds to the original; ii. 6 shows a predominating influence of the same; and xxii. 24 exhibits a subordinate influence in the use of a verb.

Some of the citations cannot be properly placed in either class, owing to their peculiarities or generality. This is not surprising in the case of those interwoven with the sermon on the mount, such as v. 31, 33, because they are not taken from the law, but from Pharisaic tradition.

The citation from *the prophets* in ii. 23, seems to allude not only to Isai. xi. 1 but also to Jerem. xxiii. 5; xxxiii. 15; Zech. iii. 8; vi. 12. There is a double meaning in the epithet *Nazarene*; *the sprout* or *branch*, and *of Nazareth*. The evangelist indulges in a Jewish midrash, which has one or more mystical senses beneath the obvious one.

The canon of Bleek respecting the quotations does not hold good in all instances. It is not correct to say, that all those which result from the evangelist's own reflection are taken from the Hebrew; neither is it true that such as are inserted into the context of the narrative are uniformly from the Septuagint. i. 23 is an exception to the former, being from the LXX.; and xxii. 24 an exception to the latter, being from the Hebrew. ii. 6, which has reference to the Hebrew, is also an exception to the rule. The influence of the Septuagint is not always absent from the citations of the original, though it is comparatively small. But notwithstanding the exceptions taken to the classification by Ebrard and Delitzsch, it is substantially sound. In the first class, seven agree more or less closely with the Hebrew, and

only two with the LXX.; in the second class, there are three gradational exceptions to derivation from the LXX., which is not surprising in a list much more numerous than the first.

COMMENTARIES.

The best commentaries are those of De Wette, 1857; Meyer, 1864; Olshausen, 1837; Fritzsche, 1826; Ewald, 1850; Barnes, 1843; Elsley, 1844.

END OF THE FIRST VOLUME.

LONDON: PRINTED BY
SPOTTISWOODE AND CO., NEW-STREET SQUARE
AND PARLIAMENT STREET.

00110698

Digitized with financial assistance from the
Government of Maharashtra
on 19 September, 2016